

The Dark Sides of Modern Science: Publishing and Dissemination (Part I)

Taha Sochi (Contact: t.sochi@ucl.ac.uk)
London, United Kingdom

Abstract: This is the second article in our series “The Dark Sides of Modern Science” and is about publishing and dissemination of science (and knowledge in general). As the subject of “publishing and dissemination of science” is too big, we decided to divide it in more than one part. The remarks that we stated in the Introduction of the first article of this series (i.e. “Knowledge Production and Authoring”) generally apply to this article and hence we do not need to repeat.

Keywords: Academic publishing, dissemination of knowledge, ethics of science, ethics of publishing, ethics of knowledge dissemination, morality in science, academic misconduct, corruption in science, corruption related to science.

Contents

Abstract	1
Table of Contents	2
1 Simultaneous, Duplicate and Multiple Submissions	3
2 Duplication, Overlapping and Redundancy in Publication	5
3 Hyper-Prolific Authorship and Excessive Publishing	11
4 Many- and Hyper-Authorship	13
5 Editing and Editors	15
6 Reviewing and Reviewers	20
7 Bias and Disparity in Academic Publishing	34
8 Publication Delays	43
9 Publish or Perish	45
10 Predatory and Questionable Publishers	50
11 Predatory, Questionable and Fake Conferences	59
12 Journal Hijacking	63
13 Gibberish Papers	66
14 Retraction	68
15 Censorship	77

1 Simultaneous, Duplicate and Multiple Submissions

1. S. Epstein; P. Nadler; J. Lunney. Multiple Submission, 1982.
DOI: [10.1126/science.217.4561.686.c](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.217.4561.686.c)
2. S. Pressman. Simultaneous Multiple Journal Submissions: The Case Against, 1994.
DOI: [10.1111/j.1536-7150.1994.tb02601.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1536-7150.1994.tb02601.x)
3. D.C. Stanton. Editor's Column: On Multiple Submissions, 1997.
DOI: [10.1353/nlh.1997.0042](https://doi.org/10.1353/nlh.1997.0042)
4. D.J. Torgerson; J. Adamson; S. Cockayne; et al. Submission to multiple journals: a method of reducing time to publication?, 2005. DOI: [10.1136/bmj.330.7486.305](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.330.7486.305)
5. E. Wager. Why You Should not Submit Your Work to More than One Journal at a Time, 2009. PMID: [21304628](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21304628/)
6. Y. Gao. Single versus multiple submissions in the publication process, 2009. DOI: [10.31274/etd-180810-3108](https://doi.org/10.31274/etd-180810-3108)
7. T.K. Kaul; A. Grewal. Duplicate Publications or Submissions: An Ethical Misconduct, 2010. Source: https://journals.lww.com/joacp/citation/2010/26020/Duplicate_Publications_or_Submissions__An_Ethical.1.aspx
8. S. Dogra; S. Yadav. Duplicate publication: What an editor can do?, 2010. DOI: [10.4103/0378-6323.60537](https://doi.org/10.4103/0378-6323.60537)
9. C. Uzun. Multiple Submission, Duplicate Submission and Duplicate Publication, 2013. DOI: [10.5152/balkanmedj.2013.001](https://doi.org/10.5152/balkanmedj.2013.001)
10. T.H. Sawyer. Writing for Publication: Ethics of Multiple Submissions and Copyright Concerns, 2013. DOI: [10.1080/07303084.1995.10607055](https://doi.org/10.1080/07303084.1995.10607055)
11. S.S. Leopold. Editorial: Duplicate Submission and Dual Publication: What Is So Wrong With Them?, 2013. DOI: [10.1007/s11999-013-2916-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11999-013-2916-8)
12. M.N. Kumar. Should multiple submissions become the norm in journals?, 2014. DOI: [10.1087/20140302](https://doi.org/10.1087/20140302)
13. R. Villar. What is this duplicate publication thing?, 2015. DOI: [10.1093/jhps/hnv065](https://doi.org/10.1093/jhps/hnv065)
14. Editorial. The simultaneous submission of a manuscript to more than one scientific publication: a legitimate strategy?, 2018. DOI: [10.1590/1981-22562018021.180096](https://doi.org/10.1590/1981-22562018021.180096)
15. D.M. Elston. Duplicate publication, 2019. DOI: [10.1016/j.jaad.2017.11.015](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaad.2017.11.015)
16. A.A. Bahishti. Simultaneous Submission of Journal Article: A Serious Author Misconduct, 2020. DOI: [10.21467/preprints.22](https://doi.org/10.21467/preprints.22)
17. Y. Kashnitsky; V. Kandala; E. van Wezenbeek; et al. How near-duplicate detection improves editors' and authors' publishing experience, 2021.

- DOI: [10.48550/arXiv.2108.04921](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2108.04921)
18. Z. Kocak. Are We Acting Responsibly Against Multiple Submission?, 2022. DOI: [10.4274/balkanmedj.galenos.2022.12082022](https://doi.org/10.4274/balkanmedj.galenos.2022.12082022)
 19. L. Xingen. On the phenomenon of academic papers' multiple submissions and its governance, 2022. DOI: [10.11835/j.issn.1008-5831.pj.2022.07.002](https://doi.org/10.11835/j.issn.1008-5831.pj.2022.07.002)
 20. D. Gruda. Dear journals: stop hoarding our papers, 2023. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-023-03196-y](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-023-03196-y)
 21. J.U. Izunobi. Submitting papers to several journals at once, 2023. Source: www.nature.com/articles/d41586-023-03740-w
 22. J.U. Izunobi. On the Thorny Issue of Single Submission, 2024. DOI: [10.3390/publications12040037](https://doi.org/10.3390/publications12040037)
 23. S. Manley. Simultaneous submissions without simultaneous peer review, 2025. DOI: [10.1093/reseval/rvaf027](https://doi.org/10.1093/reseval/rvaf027)
 24. T. Klufas; A. Ajmani; A.E. Zhou; et al. Ethical implications of dual journal submissions, 2025. DOI: [10.1016/j.jaad.2025.01.047](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaad.2025.01.047)
 25. G. Curfman. Publishers face antitrust lawsuit with potential implications for peer review, duplicate submission, and dissemination practices, 2025. DOI: [10.1093/haschl/qxaf018](https://doi.org/10.1093/haschl/qxaf018)
 26. [Handling concurrent and duplicate submissions.](#)
 27. [Overlapping Publications.](#)
 28. [Simultaneous Submission.](#)
 29. [Understanding the ICMJE guidelines on acceptable duplicate \(similar\) publications.](#)
 30. [Academic Asphyxiation: The Inequitable Expectation of 'Serial Monogamy' in Manuscript Submissions to Scholarly Journals.](#)
 31. [All You Need to Know about Simultaneous Submissions.](#)
 32. [The dawn of the age of duplicate peer review.](#)
 33. [Introduction to Guidelines on Multiple Submission and Prior Publication.](#)
 34. [Is it time to rewrite the rules on duplicate submission in the age of preprints?.](#)
 35. [Multiple, duplicate, concurrent publication/simultaneous submission.](#)
 36. [Taylor & Francis Pilots Duplicate Submission Detection Tool.](#)
 37. [Reevaluating the Single Submission Rule in Scholarly Publishing.](#)
 38. [Simultaneous & Duplicate Submissions, Interesting Cases.](#)
 39. [Duplicate publications and simultaneous submissions.](#)
 40. [The Impact of Duplicate Submission: Protecting Your Academic and Professional Rep-](#)

utation.

41. [Simultaneous & Duplicate Submissions, The Argument.](#)
42. [Simultaneous & Duplicate Submissions, Ethics.](#)
43. [Repetitive duplicate submission to multiple journals and redundant publication.](#)
44. [Unethical Dual Submission Raises Concerns in Academic Publishing.](#)

2 Duplication, Overlapping and Redundancy in Publication

1. G. Radulescu. Duplicate Publication Is Boring, 1985.
[DOI: 10.1001/archpedi.1985.02140040017015](#)
2. D.M. Bier; V.A. Fulginiti; J.M. Garfunkel; et al. Duplicate publication and related problems, 1990. [PMID: 2251037](#)
3. H. Barnard; A.J. Overbeke. Duplicate publication of original manuscripts in and from the Nederlands Tijdschrift voor Geneeskunde, 1993. [PMID: 8459858](#)
4. S.S. Blancett; A. Flanagan; R.K. Young. Duplicate publication in the nursing literature, 1995. [DOI: 10.1111/j.1547-5069.1995.tb00813.x](#)
5. B.P. Giordano. Duplicate publication wastes readers' time, clutters the literature, violates copyright law, and delays publication of timely articles, 1995.
[DOI: 10.1016/s0001-2092\(06\)63643-0](#)
6. J.P. Kassirer; M. Angell. Redundant Publication: A Reminder, 1995.
[DOI: 10.1056/NEJM199508173330709](#)
7. H.A. Lando. Overlapping publications, 1995. [DOI: 10.1136/tc.4.1.93](#)
8. P. Huston; D. Moher. Redundancy, disaggregation, and the integrity of medical research, 1996. [DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736\(96\)90153-1](#)
9. M.R. Tramer; D.J.M. Reynolds; H.J. McQuay. Impact of covert duplicate publication on meta-analysis: a case study, 1997. [DOI: 10.1136/bmj.315.7109.635](#)
10. T. Jefferson. Redundant publication in biomedical sciences: Scientific misconduct or necessity?, 1998. [DOI: 10.1007/s11948-998-0043-9](#)
11. Jr E.A. Franken. Duplicate publication: Crime and punishment, 1998.
[DOI: 10.1016/S1076-6332\(98\)80025-1](#)
12. J. Britton; A.J. Knox. Duplicate publication, redundant publication, and disclosure of closely related publications, 1999. [DOI: 10.1136/thx.54.5.378](#)
13. B.K. Cho; F. Rosenfeldt; M.I. Turina; et al. Joint statement on redundant (dupli-

- cate) publication by the Editors of the undersigned cardiothoracic journals, 2000. DOI: [10.1016/S0003-4975\(00\)01088-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0003-4975(00)01088-2)
14. M. Schein; R. Paladugu. Redundant surgical publications: Tip of the iceberg?, 2001. DOI: [10.1067/msy.2001.114549](https://doi.org/10.1067/msy.2001.114549)
 15. B.J. Bailey. Duplicate Publication in the Field of Otolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery, 2002. DOI: [10.1067/mhn.2002.122698](https://doi.org/10.1067/mhn.2002.122698)
 16. R. Davidhizar; J.N. Giger. Duplicate Publication, Part 1: Consideration of the Issues, 2002. DOI: [10.1111/j.1750-4910.2002.tb00486.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1750-4910.2002.tb00486.x)
 17. H. Melander; J. Ahlqvist-Rastad; G. Meijer; B. Beermann. Evidence b(i)ased medicine – selective reporting from studies sponsored by pharmaceutical industry: review of studies in new drug applications, 2003. DOI: [10.1136/bmj.326.7400.1171](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.326.7400.1171)
 18. A.N. DeMaria. Duplicate publication: insights into the essence of a medical journal, 2003. DOI: [10.1016/s0735-1097\(03\)00002-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0735-1097(03)00002-0)
 19. S.M. Mojon-Azzi; X. Jiang; U. Wagner; D.S. Mojon. Journals: redundant publications are bad news, 2003. DOI: [10.1038/421209a](https://doi.org/10.1038/421209a)
 20. V. Yank; D. Barnes. Consensus and contention regarding redundant publications in clinical research: cross-sectional survey of editors and authors, 2003. DOI: [10.1136/jme.29.2.109](https://doi.org/10.1136/jme.29.2.109)
 21. L. Goldman. Overlapping publications, 2003. DOI: [10.1016/j.amjmed.2003.09.011](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amjmed.2003.09.011)
 22. E. von Elm; G. Poglia; B. Walder; M.R. Tramer. Different Patterns of Duplicate Publication: An Analysis of Articles Used in Systematic Reviews, 2004. DOI: [10.1001/jama.291.8.974](https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.291.8.974)
 23. D.S. Reeves; R. Wise; C.W.E. Drummond. Duplicate publication: a cautionary tale, 2004. DOI: [10.1093/jac/dkh098](https://doi.org/10.1093/jac/dkh098)
 24. L. Brochard. Redundant publications, or piling up the medals. Getting published is not the Olympic Games, 2004. DOI: [10.1007/s00134-004-2459-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00134-004-2459-2)
 25. F. Alfonso; J. Bermejo; J. Segovia. Duplicate or Redundant Publication: Can We Afford It?, 2005. DOI: [10.1016/S1885-5857\(06\)60739-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1885-5857(06)60739-1)
 26. S.T. Hegyvary. What Every Author Should Know About Redundant and Duplicate Publication, 2005. DOI: [10.1111/j.1547-5069.2005.00051.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1547-5069.2005.00051.x)
 27. C. Johnson. Repetitive, Duplicate, and Redundant Publications: A Review for Authors and Readers, 2006. DOI: [10.1016/j.jmpt.2006.07.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmpt.2006.07.001)
 28. P. Durani. Duplicate publications: redundancy in plastic surgery literature, 2006. DOI: [10.1016/j.bjps.2005.11.039](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bjps.2005.11.039)
 29. M.P. Anderson. Plagiarism, Copyright Violation, and Dual Publication: Are you

- guilty?, 2006. DOI: [10.1111/j.1745-6584.2006.00246.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6584.2006.00246.x)
30. P. Abraham. Duplicate and salami publications, 2006. Source: <https://utoronto.scholaris.ca/server/api/core/bitstreams/6386b466-e210-4f8a-a895-477c128a39cf/content>
 31. T.T. Yoshikawa; J.G. Ouslander. Integrity in Publishing: Update on Policies and Statements on Authorship, Duplicate Publications, and Conflict of Interest, 2007. DOI: [10.1111/j.1532-5415.2007.01104.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-5415.2007.01104.x)
 32. J. Lumley; J. Daly. The issue of duplicate and/or redundant publication, 2007. DOI: [10.1111/j.1467-842X.2005.tb00739.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-842X.2005.tb00739.x)
 33. J.G. Baggs. Issues and rules for authors concerning authorship versus acknowledgements, dual publication, self plagiarism, and salami publishing, 2008. DOI: [10.1002/nur.20280](https://doi.org/10.1002/nur.20280)
 34. B. Derby. Duplication and plagiarism increasing among students, 2008. DOI: [10.1038/452029c](https://doi.org/10.1038/452029c)
 35. S.Y. Kim; C.K. Hahm; C.-W. Bae; H.M. Cho. Duplicate Publications in Korean Medical Journals Indexed in KoreaMed, 2008. DOI: [10.3346/jkms.2008.23.1.131](https://doi.org/10.3346/jkms.2008.23.1.131)
 36. I. Norman; P. Griffiths. Duplicate publication and ‘salami slicing’: Ethical issues and practical solutions, 2008. DOI: [10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2008.07.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2008.07.003)
 37. Q. Al-Awqati; E.G. Neilson. Author misrepresentation in the submission of redundant papers, 2008. DOI: [10.1038/sj.ki.5002791](https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.ki.5002791)
 38. P.F. Stahel; P.-A. Clavien; W.R. Smith; E.E. Moore. Redundant publications in surgery: a threat to patient safety?, 2008. DOI: [10.1186/1754-9493-2-6](https://doi.org/10.1186/1754-9493-2-6)
 39. C.G. Scanes. Duplicate publication - An unacceptable practice, 2009. DOI: [10.3382/ps.2009-00030](https://doi.org/10.3382/ps.2009-00030)
 40. R.J. Rohrich; D. Sullivan. Plagiarism and Dual Publication: Review of the Issues and Policy Statement, 2009. DOI: [10.1097/PRS.0b013e3181b59d42](https://doi.org/10.1097/PRS.0b013e3181b59d42)
 41. F. Habibzadeh; M.A. Winker. Duplicate publication and plagiarism: causes and cures, 2009. DOI: [10.1007/s10049-009-1229-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10049-009-1229-7)
 42. T.K. Kaul; A. Grewal. Duplicate Publications or Submissions: An Ethical Misconduct, 2010. Source: https://journals.lww.com/joacp/citation/2010/26020/Duplicate_Publications_or_Submissions__An_Ethical.1.aspx
 43. V. Lariviere; Y. Gingras. On the prevalence and scientific impact of duplicate publications in different scientific fields (1980-2007), 2010. DOI: [10.1108/00220411011023607](https://doi.org/10.1108/00220411011023607)
 44. S. Dogra; S. Yadav. Duplicate publication: What an editor can do?, 2010. DOI: [10.4103/0378-6323.60537](https://doi.org/10.4103/0378-6323.60537)
 45. B.L. Kirkman; G. Chen. Maximizing Your Data or Data Slicing? Recommendations

- for Managing Multiple Submissions from the Same Dataset, 2011.
DOI: [10.1111/j.1740-8784.2011.00228.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1740-8784.2011.00228.x)
46. S.K. Kaul. Duplicate Publications : A Wake Up Call, 2011.
DOI: [10.1016/S0377-1237\(07\)80001-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0377-1237(07)80001-3)
47. C. Labbé; D. Labbé. Duplicate and fake publications in the scientific literature: how many SCIdgen papers in computer science?, 2013. DOI: [10.1007/s11192-012-0781-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-012-0781-y)
48. X. Qi; W. Ren; L. Liu; et al. Prevalence of Covert Duplicate Publications in Budd-Chiari Syndrome Articles in China: A Systematic Analysis, 2013.
DOI: [10.1016/j.amjmed.2012.12.021](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amjmed.2012.12.021)
49. J. Karlsson; P. Beauflis. Legitimate division of large data sets, salami slicing and dual publication, where does a fraud begin?, 2013. DOI: [10.1007/s00167-013-2413-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00167-013-2413-3)
50. C. Uzun. Multiple Submission, Duplicate Submission and Duplicate Publication, 2013.
DOI: [10.5152/balkanmedj.2013.001](https://doi.org/10.5152/balkanmedj.2013.001)
51. S.S. Leopold. Editorial: Duplicate Submission and Dual Publication: What Is So Wrong With Them?, 2013. DOI: [10.1007/s11999-013-2916-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11999-013-2916-8)
52. V.W.F. Cheung; G.O.A. Lam; Y.F. Wang; N.K. Chadha. Current incidence of duplicate publication in otolaryngology, 2014. DOI: [10.1002/lary.24294](https://doi.org/10.1002/lary.24294)
53. W.-S. Choi; S.-W. Song; S.-M. Ock; et al. Duplicate publication of articles used in meta-analysis in Korea, 2014. DOI: [10.1186/2193-1801-3-182](https://doi.org/10.1186/2193-1801-3-182)
54. S.Y. Kim; C.-W. Bae; C.K. Hahm; H.M. Cho. Duplicate Publication Rate Decline in Korean Medical Journals, 2014. DOI: [10.3346/jkms.2014.29.2.172](https://doi.org/10.3346/jkms.2014.29.2.172)
55. A. Le; C.M.P. Moran; M. Bezuhly; P. Hong. Duplicate publications and related problems in published papers on oral and maxillofacial surgery, 2015.
DOI: [10.1016/j.bjoms.2015.03.008](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bjoms.2015.03.008)
56. E. Wager. Why Is Redundant Publication a Problem?, 2015. PMID: 25588220
57. R. Villar. What is this duplicate publication thing?, 2015. DOI: [10.1093/jhps/hnv065](https://doi.org/10.1093/jhps/hnv065)
58. J. Honeyman-Buck. Redundant Publication - How to Avoid Duplication, 2015. DOI: [10.1007/s10278-015-9851-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10278-015-9851-z)
59. Editorial. Joint statement on redundant (duplicate) publication by the Editors of the undersigned cardiothoracic journals, 2015. DOI: [10.1016/j.jtcvs.2015.07.088](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtcvs.2015.07.088)
60. M.P. Oksvold. Incidence of Data Duplications in a Randomly Selected Pool of Life Science Publications, 2016. DOI: [10.1007/s11948-015-9668-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-015-9668-7)
61. E.M. Bik; A. Casadevall; F.C. Fang. The Prevalence of Inappropriate Image Duplication in Biomedical Research Publications, 2016. DOI: [10.1128/mbio.00809-16](https://doi.org/10.1128/mbio.00809-16)
62. P. Smart. Redundant publication and salami slicing: the significance of splitting data,

2017. DOI: [10.1111/dmcn.13485](https://doi.org/10.1111/dmcn.13485)
63. K.B. Lewellyn; W.Q. Judge; A. Smith. Exploring the Questionable Academic Practice of Conference Paper Double Dipping, 2017. DOI: [10.5465/amle.2015.0033](https://doi.org/10.5465/amle.2015.0033)
 64. M.B. Wallace; D. Bowman; H. Hamilton-Gibbs; P.D. Siersema. Ethics in publication, part 2: duplicate publishing, salami slicing, and large retrospective multicenter case series, 2018. DOI: [10.1055/a-0582-9274](https://doi.org/10.1055/a-0582-9274)
 65. J.P.A. Ioannidis; R. Klavans; K.W. Boyack. Thousands of scientists publish a paper every five days, 2018. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-018-06185-8](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-018-06185-8)
 66. D. Ding; B. Nguyen; K. Gebel; A. Bauman; L. Bero. Duplicate and salami publication: a prevalence study of journal policies, 2019. DOI: [10.1093/ije/dyz187](https://doi.org/10.1093/ije/dyz187)
 67. D.M. Elston. Duplicate publication, 2019. DOI: [10.1016/j.jaad.2017.11.015](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaad.2017.11.015)
 68. M. Malicki; A. Utrobicic; A. Marusic. Correcting duplicate publications: follow up study of MEDLINE tagged duplications, 2019. DOI: [10.11613/BM.2019.010201](https://doi.org/10.11613/BM.2019.010201)
 69. A. Hodge. The problem of duplicate or redundant publications, 2019. DOI: [10.1017/S1368980019000351](https://doi.org/10.1017/S1368980019000351)
 70. M.U. Werner. Salami-slicing and duplicate publication: gatekeepers challenges, 2021. DOI: [10.1515/sjpain-2020-0181](https://doi.org/10.1515/sjpain-2020-0181)
 71. S. Altay; Z. Kocak. Multiple Publications From the Same Dataset: Is It Acceptable?, 2021. DOI: [10.5152/balkanmedj.2021.21008](https://doi.org/10.5152/balkanmedj.2021.21008)
 72. A. Kumar; S. Rajput; M.P. Puranik; A.M. Patel. Deciphering dimensions of overlapping publications, 2021. DOI: [10.25259/JGOH_48_2020](https://doi.org/10.25259/JGOH_48_2020)
 73. Y.V. Chekhovich; A.V. Khazov. Analysis of duplicated publications in Russian journals, 2022. DOI: [10.1016/j.joi.2021.101246](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2021.101246)
 74. F. Jawad. Redundant Publication - A Dilemma of Publication Ethics, 2022. DOI: [10.47391/JPMA.22-001](https://doi.org/10.47391/JPMA.22-001)
 75. A. Muraleedharan; B.A. Kumar. The malady of redundant publications: Common yet poorly understood, 2022. DOI: [10.4103/jcrsm.jcrsm_85_22](https://doi.org/10.4103/jcrsm.jcrsm_85_22)
 76. V. Menon; N. Varadharajan; S.K. Praharaj; S. Ameen. Trust but verify: An analysis of redundant publications from two major psychiatry journals in India, 2022. DOI: [10.4103/indianjpsychiatry.indianjpsychiatry_152_22](https://doi.org/10.4103/indianjpsychiatry.indianjpsychiatry_152_22)
 77. A. Day. Exploratory analysis of text duplication in peer-review reveals peer-review fraud and paper mills, 2022. DOI: [10.1007/s11192-022-04504-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-022-04504-5)
 78. J. Kojuri; P. Nabeiei; N. Shokrpour. Policy on Duplicate Publication: Professional Ethics, 2023. DOI: [10.30476/jamp.2022.97492.1761](https://doi.org/10.30476/jamp.2022.97492.1761)
 79. R. Dixit; M. Pandey. Readdressing the Current Challenges of Image Duplication in

Scientific Publications, 2024. DOI: [10.1007/978-981-97-4060-4_15](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-97-4060-4_15)

80. Duplicate publication.
81. Understanding the ICMJE guidelines on acceptable duplicate (similar) publications.
82. Multiple, duplicate, concurrent publication/simultaneous submission.
83. Duplicate publications and simultaneous submissions.
84. Repetitive duplicate submission to multiple journals and redundant publication.
85. Understanding Redundant Publication and Salami Slicing in Research.
86. Overlapping Publications.
87. Simultaneous Submission.
88. Acceptable Secondary Publication: Publishing the same research in Multiple Languages.
89. Overlapping Publication.
90. Duplicate (Dual) Publications.
91. Overlapping Publications.
92. Text and Data Duplication in Scholarly Publishing: Home.
93. Inadvertent duplicate publication of the same article a month apart in the same journal.
94. Originality and duplication in scientific publications.
95. Image duplication in scientific papers: how AI outperforms humans at detecting research misconduct.
96. Policy Concerning Duplicate and Redundant Publications.
97. Journals are failing to address duplication in the literature, says a new study.
98. Addressing duplicate submission in academic publishing: Who bears responsibility?.
99. The Ethics of "Double Dipping".
100. Redundant Publication: The Editorial Policy Committee of the Council of Science Editors.
101. What are redundant Publications?.
102. Seven steps to dual publication.
103. Publishing the same study twice - an acceptable practice?.
104. Overlapping Publications.
105. Redundancy, Publication Overlap, and Other Forms of Duplication.
106. Overlapping publications.
107. Serious Problems of Multiple Publication or Redundant publication.
108. Double Dipping in Conference Papers.

3 Hyper-Prolific Authorship and Excessive Publishing

1. W.J. Broad. Science can't keep up with the flood of new journals, 1988.
DOI: [10.1364/AO.27.001215](https://doi.org/10.1364/AO.27.001215)
2. L.B. Andersen; T. Pallesen. "Not Just for the Money?" How Financial Incentives Affect the Number of Publications at Danish Research Institutions, 2008.
DOI: [10.1080/10967490801887889](https://doi.org/10.1080/10967490801887889)
3. E. Wager; S. Singhvi; S. Kleinert. Too much of a good thing? An observational study of prolific authors, 2015. DOI: [10.7717/peerj.1154](https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.1154)
4. J.P.A. Ioannidis; R. Klavans; K.W. Boyack. Thousands of scientists publish a paper every five days, 2018. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-018-06185-8](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-018-06185-8)
5. M. Price. Some scientists publish more than 70 papers a year. Here's how-and why-they do it, 2018. DOI: [10.1126/science.aav4004](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aav4004)
6. P.G. Altbach; H. de Wit. Too Much Academic Research Is Being Published, 2019. DOI: [10.6017/ihe.2019.96.10767](https://doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2019.96.10767)
7. D. Moris. Highly prolific authors in medical science: from charisma to opportunism, 2020. Source: <https://jbuon.com/archive/25-4-2136.pdf>
8. J.P.A. Ioannidis; M. Salholz-Hillel; K.W. Boyack; J. Baas. The rapid, massive growth of COVID-19 authors in the scientific literature, 2021. DOI: [10.1098/rsos.210389](https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.210389)
9. J.S.G. Chu; J.A. Evans. Slowed canonical progress in large fields of science, 2021. DOI: [10.1073/pnas.2021636118](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2021636118)
10. A.J. Abduh. Hyperprolific authors in the top 2% scientists of the world, 2022. DOI: [10.22541/au.167243694.40444786/v2](https://doi.org/10.22541/au.167243694.40444786/v2)
11. J.O. Neher. Implausibly prolific, 2022. DOI: [10.1097/EBP.0000000000001768](https://doi.org/10.1097/EBP.0000000000001768)
12. A. Dance. Stop the peer-review treadmill. I want to get off, 2023.
DOI: [10.1038_d41586-023-00403-8](https://doi.org/10.1038_d41586-023-00403-8)
13. E. Moreira; W. Meira Jr.; M.A. Goncalves; A.H.F. Laender. The rise of hyperprolific authors in computer science: Characterization and implications, 2023.
DOI: [10.1007/s11192-023-04676-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-023-04676-8)
14. C. Wilcox. ScienceAdviser: Scientists are publishing too many papers-and that's bad for science, 2023. DOI: [10.1126/science.adm9969](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.adm9969)
15. G. Conroy. Surge in number of 'extremely productive' authors concerns scientists, 2023.
DOI: [10.1038/d41586-023-03865-y](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-023-03865-y)
16. A. Abduh. Who are the hyper prolific authors in environmental sciences?, 2023. DOI: [10.31223/X5WT0R](https://doi.org/10.31223/X5WT0R)

17. M.A. Hanson; P.G. Barreiro; P. Crosetto; D. Brockington. The strain on scientific publishing, 2024. DOI: [10.1162/qss_a_00327](https://doi.org/10.1162/qss_a_00327)
18. V. da F. Vieira; C.H.G. Ferreira; J.M. Almeida; et al. A network-driven study of hyperprolific authors in computer science, 2024. DOI: [10.1007/s11192-024-04940-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-024-04940-5)
19. J.P.A. Ioannidis; T.A. Collins; J. Baas. Evolving patterns of extreme publishing behavior across science, 2024. DOI: [10.1007/s11192-024-05117-w](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-024-05117-w)
20. A. Abduh. Examining Extreme Publishing Behavior: Insights into Hyperprolific Authors in Earth & Environmental Sciences (2000-2022), 2024. DOI: [10.6084/m9.figshare.26490625](https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.26490625)
21. G. Abramo; C.A. D'Angelo. Hyperprolific authorship: Unveiling the extent of extreme publishing in the 'publish or perish' era, 2025. DOI: [10.1016/j.joi.2025.101658](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2025.101658)
22. B. Iqbal; T. Kambale. Unraveling the Enigma of Hyperprolific Authors: How much is too much!, 2025. DOI: [10.4103/mjdrdypu.mjdrdypu_619_23](https://doi.org/10.4103/mjdrdypu.mjdrdypu_619_23)
23. F. Zarantonello; N. Sella; A. De Cassai; et al. Identifying and analyzing extremely productive authors in intensive care medicine: A scientometric analysis, 2025. DOI: [10.1016/j.tacc.2024.101515](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tacc.2024.101515)
24. M. Naddaf. Low-quality papers based on public health data are flooding the scientific literature, 2025. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-025-02241-2](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-025-02241-2)
25. Too much academic research is being published.
26. The strain on academic publishing.
27. Excessive growth in the number of scientific publications.
28. Is high-volume publishing threatening research integrity?.
29. Scientific publishing: How much is too much?.
30. Publish less, disrupt more.
31. Avalanche of papers could erode trust in science.
32. Why are many obviously pointless papers published, or worse studied?.
33. The prolific authors publishing an equivalent of one paper every five days.
34. Hyperprolific Authors.
35. When it comes to authorship, how prolific is too prolific?.
36. 'Nepotistic' journals fast-track hyperprolific authors.
37. Who are these Hyperprolific Authors in Australian Academics?.
38. The Rise of Hyperprolific Authors: Analyzing Australia's Top 250 Researchers in 2025.
39. Thousands of scientists publish a paper every five days.
40. The vast majority of hyperprolific authors (7,888 author records, 86%) published in

physics.

41. Hyper-prolific authors in Jan & Feb 2025.
42. ‘Hyperprolific’ academics ‘don’t meet author criteria’ - study.
43. Beware the Ides of March: The Destiny of Highly Prolific Authors.
44. The scientists who publish a paper every five days.
45. Prolific authors.
46. Erasmus MC is world champion in prolific authorship.
47. One of the world’s most cited scientists, Rafael Luque, suspended without pay for 13 years.
48. Meet the author who has published more than 500 letters to the editor in a year.
49. Evolving patterns of extremely productive publishing behavior across science.
50. Cups, Buckets, Pools, and Puddles: When the Flood of Papers Won’t Abate, Which Do You Choose?.
51. Is Scholarly Publishing Self-Flooding?.
52. Rise in "extremely productive" authors sparks concern.
53. Is scientific progress waning? Too many new papers may mean novel ideas rarely rack up citations.
54. The "You’re only allowed to publish 2 or 3 journal articles per year" rule.

4 Many- and Hyper-Authorship

1. B. Cronin. Hyperauthorship: A postmodern perversion or evidence of a structural shift in scholarly communication practices?, 2001. DOI: [10.1002/asi.1097](https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.1097)
2. E. Davenport; B. Cronin. Who dunnit? Metatags and hyperauthorship, 2001. DOI: [10.1002/asi.1123](https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.1123)
3. D. Kennedy. Multiple Authors, Multiple Problems, 2003. DOI: [10.1126/science.301.5634.733](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.301.5634.733)
4. S.I. Papatheodorou; T.A. Trikalinos; J.P.A. Ioannidis. Inflated numbers of authors over time have not been just due to increasing research complexity, 2008. DOI: [10.1016/j.jclinepi.2007.07.017](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2007.07.017)
5. C. Baethge. Publish Together or Perish, 2008. DOI: [10.3238/arztebl.2008.0380](https://doi.org/10.3238/arztebl.2008.0380)
6. P.J. Wyatt. Commentary: Too many authors, too few creators, 2012. DOI: [10.1063/PT.3.1499](https://doi.org/10.1063/PT.3.1499)
7. E. Shaffer. Too many authors spoil the credit, 2014. DOI: [10.1155/2014/381676](https://doi.org/10.1155/2014/381676)

8. A. Cropley. The specter of scholarship without novel ideas: Replication, hyperauthorship and the danger of stagnation, 2017. DOI: [10.1037/aca0000076](https://doi.org/10.1037/aca0000076)
9. Y.-W. Changa; M.-H. Huang; M.-J. Chiu. Hyperauthorship: A comparative study of genetics and high-energy physics research, 2019. DOI: [10.22452/mjlis.vol24no1.2](https://doi.org/10.22452/mjlis.vol24no1.2)
10. D.S. Chawla. Hyperauthorship: global projects spark surge in thousand-author papers, 2019. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-019-03862-0](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-019-03862-0)
11. B. Nogrady. Hyperauthorship: the publishing challenges for ‘big team’ science, 2023. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-023-00575-3](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-023-00575-3)
12. E.T. Borer; A.S. MacDougall; C.J. Stevens; et al. Writing a massively multi-authored paper: Overcoming barriers to meaningful authorship for all, 2023. DOI: [10.1111/2041-210X.14096](https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.14096)
13. M. Jakab; E. Kittl; T. Kiesslich. How many authors are (too) many? A retrospective, descriptive analysis of authorship in biomedical publications, 2024. DOI: [10.1007/s11192-024-04928-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-024-04928-1)
14. L. Dinh; W.C. Barley; L. Johnson; B.F. Allan. Hyperauthored papers disproportionately amplify important egocentric network metrics, 2024. DOI: [10.1162/qss_a_00307](https://doi.org/10.1162/qss_a_00307)
15. D.S. Dotson. Mega-authorship implications: How many scientists can fit into one cell?, 2024. DOI: [10.1080/08989621.2024.2318790](https://doi.org/10.1080/08989621.2024.2318790)
16. P. Praus. A note on the topic of single-author articles in science, 2025. DOI: [10.1007/s11192-025-05315-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-025-05315-0)
17. [Hyperauthorship in Scientific Publications: a blessing and a curse?.](#)
18. [Hyper-authorship skews science literature impact analysis.](#)
19. [Call to remove ‘hyper-authored’ papers from research metrics.](#)
20. [Global Research Report: Multi-authorship and research analytics.](#)
21. [Hyper Authorship Increases Exponentially in Global Projects.](#)
22. [New Global Research Report from the Institute for Scientific Information examines impact of multi-authorship on citations.](#)
23. [Multi-authorship and research analytics.](#)
24. [The case for Open Research: the authorship problem.](#)
25. [Mass authorship on the rise: is this good or bad?.](#)
26. [New Global Research Report from the Institute for Scientific Information examines impact of multi-authorship on citations.](#)
27. [Long lists are eroding the value of being a scientific author.](#)
28. [When a Scholar is One Among 500, What Does it Mean to be "An Author"?](#)

29. [Hyperauthorship in academia - what is it? Is it healthy?](#).
30. [Academic Authorship: How Many Authors Are Too Many?](#).
31. [A scientific paper with 5000 authors is absurd, but does science need "papers" at all?](#).
32. [Long author-lists on research papers are threatening the academic work system.](#)
33. [Most authors on a single peer-reviewed academic paper.](#)

5 Editing and Editors

1. D.N. Laband. Publishing Favoritism: A Critique of Department Rankings Based on Quantitative Publishing Performance, 1985. DOI: [10.2307/1059636](#)
2. D.N. Laband; M.J. Piette. Favoritism versus Search for Good Papers: Empirical Evidence Regarding the Behavior of Journal Editors, 1994. DOI: [10.1086/261927](#)
3. L.L. Lange; P.A. Frensch. Gaining scientific recognition by position: Does editorship increase citation rates?, 1999. DOI: [10.1007/BF02458490](#)
4. J. Hoey. When editors publish in their own journals, 1999. PMCID: [PMC1230831](#)
5. J. Hoey; C.E. Caplan; T. Elmslie; et al. Science, sex and semantics: the firing of George Lundberg, 1999. PMCID: [PMC1230076](#)
6. C.M. Olson; D. Rennie; D. Cook; et al. Publication Bias in Editorial Decision Making, 2002. DOI: [10.1001/jama.287.21.2825](#)
7. S. Saxena; I. Levav; P. Maulik; B. Saraceno. How international are the editorial boards of leading psychiatry journals?, 2003. DOI: [10.1016/S0140-6736\(03\)12528-7](#)
8. G. Wilkinson. How international are the editorial boards of leading psychiatry journals?, 2003. DOI: [10.1016/S0140-6736\(03\)12942-X](#)
9. O. Tutarel. Composition of the editorial boards of leading medical education journals, 2004. DOI: [10.1186/1471-2288-4-3](#)
10. F. Godlee. Dealing with editorial misconduct, 2004. DOI: [10.1136/bmj.329.7478.1301](#)
11. I. Haivas; S. Schroter; F. Waechter; R. Smith. Editors' declaration of their own conflicts of interest, 2004. DOI: [10.1503/cmaj.1031982](#)
12. Q. Schiermeier. Self-publishing editor set to retire, 2008. DOI: [10.1038/456432a](#)
13. Editorial. Editor to quit over hoax open-access paper, 2009. DOI: [10.1038/459901a](#)
14. N. Gilbert. Editor will quit over hoax paper, 2009. DOI: [10.1038/news.2009.571](#)
15. J. Luty; S.M.R. Arokiadass; J.M. Easow; J.R. Anapreddy. Preferential publication of editorial board members in medical specialty journals, 2009. DOI: [10.1136/jme.2008.026740](#)

16. A.A.C. Teixeira; M.F. da Costa. Who Rules the Ruler? On the Misconduct of Journal Editors, 2010. DOI: [10.1007/s10805-010-9107-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-010-9107-y)
17. J. Matias-Guiu; R. Garcia-Ramos. Editorial bias in scientific publications, 2011. DOI: [10.1016/S2173-5808\(11\)70001-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2173-5808(11)70001-3)
18. J. Matias-Guiu; R. Garcia-Ramos. Editorial bias in scientific publications, 2011. DOI: [10.1016/S2173-5808\(11\)70001-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2173-5808(11)70001-3)
19. L. Bosnjak; L. Puljak; K. Vukojevic; A. Marusic. Analysis of a number and type of publications that editors publish in their own journals: case study of scholarly journals in Croatia, 2011. DOI: [10.1007/s11192-010-0207-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-010-0207-7)
20. E. Smith; M.-J. Potvin; B. Williams-Jones. Accessibility and transparency of editor conflicts of interest policy instruments in medical journals, 2012. DOI: [10.1136/medethics-2012-100524](https://doi.org/10.1136/medethics-2012-100524)
21. A.H. Yoon. Editorial Bias in Legal Academia, 2013. DOI: [10.1093/jla/lat005](https://doi.org/10.1093/jla/lat005)
22. J. Mani; J. Makarevic; E. Juengel; et al. I Publish in I Edit? - Do Editorial Board Members of Urologic Journals Preferentially Publish Their Own Scientific Work?, 2013. DOI: [10.1371/journal.pone.0083709](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0083709)
23. M. Shelomi. Editorial Misconduct-Definition, Cases, and Causes, 2014. DOI: [10.3390/publications2020051](https://doi.org/10.3390/publications2020051)
24. C.K. Rosing; R. Junges; A.N. Haas. Publication rates of editorial board members in oral health journals, 2014. DOI: [10.1590/1807-3107BOR-2014.vol28.0042](https://doi.org/10.1590/1807-3107BOR-2014.vol28.0042)
25. J. Brogaard; J. Engelberg; C.A. Parsons. Networks and productivity: Causal evidence from editor rotations, 2014. DOI: [10.1016/j.jfineco.2013.10.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2013.10.006)
26. K. Moustafa. Is there bias in editorial choice? Yes, 2015. DOI: [10.1007/s11192-015-1617-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-015-1617-3)
27. W.H. Walters. Do Editorial Board Members in Library and Information Science Publish Disproportionately in the Journals for Which They Serve as Board Members?, 2015. DOI: [10.3138/jsp.46.4.03](https://doi.org/10.3138/jsp.46.4.03)
28. D. Hsiehchen; M. Espinoza. Detecting editorial bias in medical publishing, 2016. DOI: [10.1007/s11192-015-1753-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-015-1753-9)
29. E. Sarigol; D. Garcia; I. Scholtes; F. Schweitzer. Quantifying the effect of editor-author relations on manuscript handling times, 2017. DOI: [10.1007/s11192-017-2309-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-017-2309-y)
30. F. Baylis; A. Cattapan; D. Snow. Editorial Misconduct, 2017. DOI: [10.2307/44732787](https://doi.org/10.2307/44732787)
31. P. Sorokowski; E. Kulczycki; A. Sorokowska; K. Pisanski. Predatory journals recruit fake editor, 2017. DOI: [10.1038/543481a](https://doi.org/10.1038/543481a)
32. G. Bravo; M. Farjam; F.G. Moreno; et al. Hidden connections: Network effects on edi-

- torial decisions in four computer science journals, 2018. DOI: [10.1016/j.joi.2017.12.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2017.12.002)
33. B. Goudra; D. Gouda; G. Gouda; et al. Possible Bias in the Publication Trends of High Impact Factor Anesthesiology and Gastroenterology Journals -An Analysis of 5 Years' Data, 2018. DOI: [10.4103/aer.AER_116_18](https://doi.org/10.4103/aer.AER_116_18)
 34. R. Zdenek. Editorial Board Self-Publishing Rates in Czech Economic Journals, 2018. DOI: [10.1007/s11948-017-9922-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-017-9922-2)
 35. R. Zdenek; J. Lososova. An analysis of editorial board members' publication output in agricultural economics and policy journals, 2018. DOI: [10.1007/s11192-018-2881-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-018-2881-9)
 36. R. Heesen. When journal editors play favorites, 2018. DOI: [10.1007/s11098-017-0895-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11098-017-0895-4)
 37. J.A.T. da Silva; J. Dobranszki. Editors moving forward: stick to academic basics, maximize transparency and respect, and enforce the rules, 2018. DOI: [10.1701/2902.29244](https://doi.org/10.1701/2902.29244)
 38. M. Goyanes. Editorial boards in communication sciences journals: Plurality or standardization?, 2019. DOI: [10.1177/1748048518825322](https://doi.org/10.1177/1748048518825322)
 39. S. Youk; H.S. Park. Where and what do they publish? Editors' and editorial board members' affiliated institutions and the citation counts of their endogenous publications in the field of communication, 2019. DOI: [10.1007/s11192-019-03169-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-019-03169-x)
 40. J. Lundine; I.L. Bourgeault; K. Glonti; et al. "I don't see gender": Conceptualizing a gendered system of academic publishing, 2019. DOI: [10.1016/j.socscimed.2019.112388](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2019.112388)
 41. J.A.T. da Silva; J. Dobranszki; R.H. Bhar; C.T. Mehlman. Editors Should Declare Conflicts of Interest, 2019. DOI: [10.1007/s11673-019-09908-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11673-019-09908-2)
 42. M.S. Reaee-Zavareh; H. Karimi-Sari. How Often Do the Iranian Medical Journal Editors-in-Chief Publish in Their Own Journals?, 2020. DOI: [10.18502/ijph.v49i7.3592](https://doi.org/10.18502/ijph.v49i7.3592)
 43. S. Rosenblum; R.L. St. Clair; K.R. Isett; R. Johnson. Publishing while editor: Transparency and behaviour in public administration journals, 2020. DOI: [10.1111/1467-8500.12411](https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8500.12411)
 44. B. Sen-Crowe; M. Sutherland; A. Shir; et al. Variations in surgical peer-reviewed publications among editorial board members, associate editors and their respective journal: Towards maintaining academic integrity, 2020. DOI: [10.1016/j.amsu.2020.10.042](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amsu.2020.10.042)
 45. M. Downes. Membership of the editorial boards of journals published by the predatory publisher OMICS: willing and unwilling participation, 2021. DOI: [10.47989/irpaper912](https://doi.org/10.47989/irpaper912)
 46. H. Else. Scammers impersonate guest editors to get sham papers published, 2021. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-021-03035-y](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-021-03035-y)
 47. A. Scanff; F. Naudet; I.A. Cristea; et al. A survey of biomedical journals to detect editorial bias and nepotistic behavior, 2021. DOI: [10.1371/journal.pbio.3001133](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.3001133)
 48. D. Barker. Curating the Canon: Editorial Decision-Making, Bias and Privilege in Pub-

- lishing, 2021. DOI: [10.20897/jcasc/11118](https://doi.org/10.20897/jcasc/11118)
49. L.S. Green; M.P. Johnston. A contextualization of editorial misconduct in the library and information science academic information ecosystem, 2021. DOI: [10.1002/asi.24593](https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.24593)
 50. A. Siganos. Guest editor networking in special issues, 2021. DOI: [10.1016/j.irfa.2021.101770](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.irfa.2021.101770)
 51. R.H. Pickler; C.L. Munro; F.E. Likis. Addressing racism in editorial practices, 2021. DOI: [10.1111/nae2.11](https://doi.org/10.1111/nae2.11)
 52. M. Knochelmann; F. Hesselmann; M. Reinhart; C. Schendzielorz. The Rise of the Guest Editor-Discontinuities of Editorship in Scholarly Publishing, 2022. DOI: [10.3389/frma.2021.748171](https://doi.org/10.3389/frma.2021.748171)
 53. X. Jiang; Y. Shi. Editorial bias in top-tier education journals: Factors influencing publishable scholarship in China, 2022. DOI: [10.1002/leap.1486](https://doi.org/10.1002/leap.1486)
 54. I. Sverdlichenko; S. Xie; E. Margolin. Impact of institutional affiliation bias on editorial publication decisions: A bibliometric analysis of three ophthalmology journals, 2022. DOI: [10.1016/j.jemep.2022.100758](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jemep.2022.100758)
 55. C.G. Torres. Editorial misconduct: the case of online predatory journals, 2022. DOI: [10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e08999](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e08999)
 56. J.A.T. da Silva. Should editors with multiple retractions or a record of academic misconduct serve on journal editorial boards?, 2022. DOI: [10.3897/ese.2022.e95926](https://doi.org/10.3897/ese.2022.e95926)
 57. L. Tutuncu; R. Yucedogru; I. Sarisoy. Academic favoritism at work: insider bias in Turkish national journals, 2022. DOI: [10.1007/s11192-022-04355-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-022-04355-0)
 58. G. Helgesson; I. Radun; J. Radun; G. Nilsson. Editors publishing in their own journals: A systematic review of prevalence and a discussion of normative aspects, 2022. DOI: [10.1002/leap.1449](https://doi.org/10.1002/leap.1449)
 59. R. Palladino; R. Alfano; M. Moccia; et al. Association Between Institutional Affiliations of Academic Editors and Authors in Medical Journals, 2022. DOI: [10.1007/s11606-022-07483-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-022-07483-8)
 60. F. Bransch; M. Kvasnicka. Male Gatekeepers: Gender Bias in the Publishing Process?, 2022. DOI: [10.1016/j.jebo.2022.07.031](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2022.07.031)
 61. E.R. Palser; M. Lazerwitz; A. Fotopoulou. Gender and geographical disparity in editorial boards of journals in psychology and neuroscience, 2022. DOI: [10.1038/s41593-022-01012-w](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41593-022-01012-w)
 62. J.A.T. da Silva; Q.-H. Vuong. Editors with multiple retractions, but who serve on journal editorial boards: Case studies, 2023. DOI: [10.12681/eml.33935](https://doi.org/10.12681/eml.33935)
 63. M.M. King. Self-publishing is common among academic-journal editors, 2023. DOI:

[10.1038/d41586-023-00028-x](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-023-00028-x)

64. B. Owens. Largest-ever study of journal editors highlights ‘self-publication’ and gender gap, 2023. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-023-00129-7](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-023-00129-7)
65. D. Strauss; S. Gran-Ruaz; M. Osman; et al. Racism and censorship in the editorial and peer review process, 2023. DOI: [10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1120938](https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1120938)
66. A. Rubin; E. Rubin; D. Segal. Editor home bias?, 2023. DOI: [10.1016/j.respol.2023.104766](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2023.104766)
67. T.S. Malkinson; D.B. Terhune; M. Kollamkulam; et al. Gender imbalances in the editorial activities of a selective journal run by academic editors, 2023. DOI: [10.1371/journal.pone.0294805](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0294805)
68. F. Liu; P. Holme; M. Chiesa; et al. Gender inequality and self-publication are common among academic editors, 2023. DOI: [10.1038/s41562-022-01498-1](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-022-01498-1)
69. F. Joelsing. Paper trail, 2024. DOI: [10.1126/science.ado0309](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.ado0309)
70. R.A. Dixon; J. Dainton. Guest-editing under the spotlight, 2024. DOI: [10.1098/rstb.2023.0478](https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2023.0478)
71. F. Javed; D. Michelogiannakis; P.E. Rossouw. Editorial bullying: an exploration of acts impacting publication ethics and related environment, 2024. DOI: [10.3389/frma.2024.1345553](https://doi.org/10.3389/frma.2024.1345553)
72. B.S. von Ungern-Sternberg; A. Regli; B. Stepanovic; K. Becke-Jakob. Authorship misconduct: professional misconduct in editorial handling of authorship, 2024. DOI: [10.1016/j.bja.2024.08.015](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bja.2024.08.015)
73. F. Joelsing; R. Watch. Paper trail, 2024. DOI: [10.1126/science.zrjehzt](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.zrjehzt)
74. A. Kulal; N. Abhishek; P. Shareena; S. Dinesh. Unmasking Favoritism and Bias in Academic Publishing: An Empirical Study on Editorial Practices, 2025. DOI: [10.1080/10999922.2024.2448875](https://doi.org/10.1080/10999922.2024.2448875)
75. R. Neveu; A. Neveu. Reputation shortcoming in academic publishing, 2025. DOI: [10.1371/journal.pone.0322012](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0322012)
76. A.A. Gurumeta; A. Davidson; R. Landau; et al. Comments on alleged editor misconduct from editors-in-chief of anaesthesia journals, 2025. DOI: [10.1016/j.bja.2024.12.017](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bja.2024.12.017)
77. M. Flick; F.A. Lobo. Editors’ note: Comments on alleged editor misconduct in anesthesiology journals, 2025. DOI: [10.1007/s10877-025-01281-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10877-025-01281-3)
78. [Massive Study Reveals Editorial Bias and Nepotism in Biomedical Journals.](#)
79. [Reflections on guest editing a Frontiers journal.](#)
80. [Editorial misconduct.](#)

81. [Richard Smith: A ripping yarn of editorial misconduct.](#)
82. [Ethical Standards for Healthcare Journal Editors: A Case Report and Recommendations.](#)
83. [Are editors or editors-in-chief biased towards authors' reputation/image when making decision about final selection or rejection of submitted work?.](#)
84. [Editorial Favoritism.](#)
85. [Misusing Editorial Power to Censor Unpopular Research.](#)
86. [Personal biases speed up research publication.](#)
87. [Academics should stop fixating on the editorial power fallacy.](#)
88. [The case against Revise and Resubmit.](#)
89. [Dozens of academic journals appoint fake editor.](#)
90. [Paper mills bribe editors to pass peer review, and detecting tumors with a blood draw.](#)
91. [Editor as author in own journal.](#)
92. [AI-generated papers are slipping past editors.](#)
93. ["Fake \[Academic\] News" industry is eroding confidence in the peer review publication process.](#)
94. [Editorial Misconduct: Likelihood and safeguards.](#)
95. [‘Foolish mistake’: Guest editor loses three articles published in his own special issues.](#)
96. [Editorial conflicts of interest.](#)

6 Reviewing and Reviewers

1. S.I. Abramowitz; B. Gomes; C.V. Abramowitz. Publish or Politic: Referee Bias in Manuscript Review, 1975. DOI: [10.1111/j.1559-1816.1975.tb00675.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1975.tb00675.x)
2. D.P. Peters; S.J. Ceci. Peer-review practices of psychological journals: The fate of published articles, submitted again, 1982. DOI: [10.1017/S0140525X00011183](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X00011183)
3. J.M. Campanario. Have referees rejected some of the most-cited articles of all times?, 1996. DOI: [10.1002/\(SICI\)1097-4571\(199604\)47:4<302::AID-ASI6>3.0.CO;2-0](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-4571(199604)47:4<302::AID-ASI6>3.0.CO;2-0)
4. C. Wenneras; A. Wold. Nepotism and sexism in peer-review, 1997. DOI: [10.1038/387341a0](https://doi.org/10.1038/387341a0)
5. A.C. Justice; M.K. Cho; M.A. Winker. Does Masking Author Identity Improve Peer Review Quality? A Randomized Controlled Trial, 1998. DOI: [10.1001/jama.280.3.240](https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.280.3.240)
6. F. Godlee; C.R. Gale; C.N. Martyn. Effect on the quality of peer review of blinding reviewers and asking them to sign their reports: a randomized controlled trial, 1998.

- DOI: [10.1001/jama.280.3.237](https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.280.3.237)
7. W.G. Baxt; J.F. Waeckerle; J.A. Berlin; M.L. Callaham. Who Reviews the Reviewers? Feasibility of Using a Fictitious Manuscript to Evaluate Peer Reviewer Performance, 1998. DOI: [10.1016/S0196-0644\(98\)70006-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0196-0644(98)70006-X)
 8. Nature. Bad peer reviewers, 2001. DOI: [10.1038/35093213](https://doi.org/10.1038/35093213)
 9. T. Tregenza. Gender bias in the refereeing process?, 2002. DOI: [10.1016/S0169-5347\(02\)02545-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0169-5347(02)02545-4)
 10. J. Couzin. ... And How the Problems Eluded Peer Reviewers and Editors, 2006. DOI: [10.1126/science.311.5757.23](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.311.5757.23)
 11. R. Smith. Peer Review: A Flawed Process at the Heart of Science and Journals, 2006. DOI: [10.1177/014107680609900414](https://doi.org/10.1177/014107680609900414)
 12. Editorial. Can peer review police fraud?, 2006. DOI: [10.1038/nm0206-149](https://doi.org/10.1038/nm0206-149)
 13. S. Schroter; N. Black; S. Evans; et al. What errors do peer reviewers detect, and does training improve their ability to detect them?, 2008. DOI: [10.1258/jrsm.2008.080062](https://doi.org/10.1258/jrsm.2008.080062)
 14. U. Sandstrom; M. Hallsten. Persistent nepotism in peer-review, 2008. DOI: [10.1007/s11192-008-0211-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-008-0211-3)
 15. A. Casadevall; F.C. Fang. Is Peer Review Censorship?, 2009. DOI: [10.1128/IAI.00018-09](https://doi.org/10.1128/IAI.00018-09)
 16. L. Bornmann; H.-D. Daniel. Reviewer and editor biases in journal peer review: an investigation of manuscript refereeing at Angewandte Chemie International Edition, 2009. DOI: [10.3152/095820209X477520](https://doi.org/10.3152/095820209X477520)
 17. M. Biagioli. From Book Censorship to Academic Peer Review, 2010. DOI: [10.1080/1045722022000003435](https://doi.org/10.1080/1045722022000003435)
 18. C.J. Lee; C.R. Sugimoto; G. Zhang; B. Cronin. Bias in peer review, 2013. DOI: [10.1002/asi.22784](https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.22784)
 19. J. Bohannon. Who's Afraid of Peer Review?, 2013. DOI: [10.1126/science.342.6154.60](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.342.6154.60)
 20. K. Siler; K. Lee; L. Bero. Measuring the effectiveness of scientific gatekeeping, 2014. DOI: [10.1073/pnas.1418218112](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1418218112)
 21. J.D. Bowman. Predatory Publishing, Questionable Peer Review, and Fraudulent Conferences, 2014. DOI: [10.5688/ajpe7810176](https://doi.org/10.5688/ajpe7810176)
 22. C. Ferguson; A. Marcus; I. Oransky. Publishing: The peer-review scam, 2014. DOI: [10.1038/515480a](https://doi.org/10.1038/515480a)
 23. R. Van Noorden. The scientists who get credit for peer review, 2014. DOI: [10.1038/nature.2014.16102](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature.2014.16102)
 24. E. Callaway. Faked peer reviews prompt 64 retractions, 2015.

- DOI: [10.1038/nature.2015.18202](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature.2015.18202)
25. M. Dadkhah; A.M. Alharbi; M.H. Al-khresheh; et al. Affiliation Oriented Journals: Don't Worry About Peer Review If You Have Good Affiliation, 2015.
DOI: [10.11591/ijece.v5i4.pp621-625](https://doi.org/10.11591/ijece.v5i4.pp621-625)
 26. J. Velterop. Peer review - issues, limitations, and future development, 2015. DOI: [10.14293/S2199-1006.1.SOR-EDU.AYXIPS.v1](https://doi.org/10.14293/S2199-1006.1.SOR-EDU.AYXIPS.v1)
 27. O. Dyer. Major publisher retracts 43 papers, alleging fake peer review, 2015. DOI: [10.1136/bmj.h1783](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.h1783)
 28. P.J. Benson. Eyes wide open: reader and author responsibility in understanding the limits of peer review, 2015. DOI: [10.1308/rcsann.2015.0032](https://doi.org/10.1308/rcsann.2015.0032)
 29. C.J. Haug. Peer-Review Fraud - Hacking the Scientific Publication Process, 2015. DOI: [10.1056/NEJMp1512330](https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMp1512330)
 30. J. Greene. Fraudsters Strike Peer Review: Stolen Passwords, Fake Reviews Threaten Biomedical Literature, 2015. DOI: [10.1016/j.annemergmed.2015.02.017](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annemergmed.2015.02.017)
 31. M.A. Hadi. Fake peer-review in research publication: revisiting research purpose and academic integrity, 2016. DOI: [10.1111/ijpp.12307](https://doi.org/10.1111/ijpp.12307)
 32. S. Kulkarni. What causes peer review scams and how can they be prevented?, 2016. DOI: [10.1002/leap.1031](https://doi.org/10.1002/leap.1031)
 33. K. Tomaselli. Practices in scholarly publishing: making sense of rejection, 2016. DOI: [10.1080/02560046.2015.1151107](https://doi.org/10.1080/02560046.2015.1151107)
 34. O. Dyer. Peer reviewer stole article and published it as his own, 2016.
DOI: [10.1136/bmj.i6768](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.i6768)
 35. A. Cohen; S. Pattanaik; P. Kumar; et al. Organised crime against the academic peer review system, 2016. DOI: [10.1111/bcp.12992](https://doi.org/10.1111/bcp.12992)
 36. M. Dansinger. Dear Plagiarist: A Letter to a Peer Reviewer Who Stole and Published Our Manuscript as His Own, 2016. DOI: [10.7326/M16-2551](https://doi.org/10.7326/M16-2551)
 37. V. Warne. Rewarding reviewers - sense or sensibility? A Wiley study explained, 2016. DOI: [10.1002/leap.1002](https://doi.org/10.1002/leap.1002)
 38. A.K. Das. 'Peer review' for scientific manuscripts: Emerging issues, potential threats, and possible remedies, 2016. DOI: [10.1016/j.mjafi.2016.02.014](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mjafi.2016.02.014)
 39. J. Han; Z. Li. How Metrics-Based Academic Evaluation Could Systematically Induce Academic Misconduct: A Case Study, 2017. DOI: [10.1215/18752160-4275144](https://doi.org/10.1215/18752160-4275144)
 40. X. Qi; H. Deng; X. Guo. Characteristics of retractions related to faked peer reviews: an overview, 2017. DOI: [10.1136/postgradmedj-2016-133969](https://doi.org/10.1136/postgradmedj-2016-133969)
 41. J.A.T. da Silva. Fake peer reviews, fake identities, fake accounts, fake data: beware!,

2017. DOI: [10.21037/amj.2017.02.10](https://doi.org/10.21037/amj.2017.02.10)
42. J. Gao; T. Zhou. Stamp out fake peer review, 2017. DOI: [10.1038/546033a](https://doi.org/10.1038/546033a)
 43. J.A.T. da Silva; A. Al-Khatib. The Clarivate™ Analytics acquisition of Publons - an evolution or commodification of peer review?, 2017. DOI: [10.1177/1747016117739941](https://doi.org/10.1177/1747016117739941)
 44. R. D'Andrea; J.P. O'Dwyer. Can editors save peer review from peer reviewers?, 2017. DOI: [10.1371/journal.pone.0186111](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0186111)
 45. M. Helmer; M. Schottdorf; A. Neef; D. Battaglia. Research: Gender bias in scholarly peer review, 2017. DOI: [10.7554/eLife.21718](https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.21718)
 46. J. Huisman; J. Smits. Duration and quality of the peer review process: the author's perspective, 2017. DOI: [10.1007/s11192-017-2310-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-017-2310-5)
 47. L. Jackson; M.A. Peters; L. Benade; et al. Is peer review in academic publishing still working?, 2018. DOI: [10.1080/23265507.2018.1479139](https://doi.org/10.1080/23265507.2018.1479139)
 48. S.P.J.M. Horbach; W. Halffman. The changing forms and expectations of peer review, 2018. DOI: [10.1186/s41073-018-0051-5](https://doi.org/10.1186/s41073-018-0051-5)
 49. M.A. Zaharie; M. Seeber. Are non-monetary rewards effective in attracting peer reviewers? A natural experiment, 2018. DOI: [10.1007/s11192-018-2912-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-018-2912-6)
 50. R. Morgan; K. Hawkins; J. Lundine. The foundation and consequences of gender bias in grant peer review processes, 2018. DOI: [10.1503/cmaj.180188](https://doi.org/10.1503/cmaj.180188)
 51. H. Rivera. Fake Peer Review and Inappropriate Authorship Are Real Evils, 2019. DOI: [10.3346/jkms.2019.34.e6](https://doi.org/10.3346/jkms.2019.34.e6)
 52. A.T. Gregory; A.R. Denniss. Everything You Need to Know About Peer Review - The Good, The Bad and The Ugly, 2019. DOI: [10.1016/j.hlc.2019.05.171](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hlc.2019.05.171)
 53. C. Wilcox. Rude reviews are pervasive and sometimes harmful, study finds, 2019. DOI: [10.1126/science.366.6472.1433](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.366.6472.1433)
 54. A.L. Romero-Olivares. Reviewers, don't be rude to nonnative English speakers, 2019. DOI: [10.1126/science.caredit.aaz7179](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.caredit.aaz7179)
 55. S. Goldstein. Publons Peer Evaluation Metrics are not Reliable Measures of Quality or Impact, 2019. DOI: [10.18438/ebliip29579](https://doi.org/10.18438/ebliip29579)
 56. A. Al-Khatib; J.A.T. da Silva. Rewarding the quantity of peer review could harm biomedical research, 2019. DOI: [10.11613/BM.2019.020201](https://doi.org/10.11613/BM.2019.020201)
 57. N.J. Silbiger; A.D. Stubler. Unprofessional peer reviews disproportionately harm underrepresented groups in STEM, 2019. DOI: [10.7717/peerj.8247](https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.8247)
 58. S. Haffar; F. Bazerbachi; M.H. Murad. Peer Review Bias: A Critical Review, 2019. DOI: [10.1016/j.mayocp.2018.09.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mayocp.2018.09.004)
 59. A. Tvina; R. Spellecy; A. Palatnik. Bias in the Peer Review Process: Can We Do

- Better?, 2019. DOI: [10.1097/AOG.0000000000003260](https://doi.org/10.1097/AOG.0000000000003260)
60. F. Chirico; J.A.T. da Silva; N. Magnavita. "Questionable" peer review in the publishing pandemic during the time of COVID-19: implications for policy makers and stakeholders, 2020. DOI: [10.3325/cmj.2020.61.300](https://doi.org/10.3325/cmj.2020.61.300)
 61. R. Van Noorden. Hundreds of scientists have peer-reviewed for predatory journals, 2020. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-020-00709-x](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-020-00709-x)
 62. J.A.T. da Silva. Is there a need for creators of imaginary authors to face legal consequences?, 2020. DOI: [10.3325/cmj.2020.61.561](https://doi.org/10.3325/cmj.2020.61.561)
 63. J.P. Tennant; T. Ross-Hellauer. The limitations to our understanding of peer review, 2020. DOI: [10.1186/s41073-020-00092-1](https://doi.org/10.1186/s41073-020-00092-1)
 64. A.F. Mavrogenis; A. Quaile; M.M. Scarlat. The good, the bad and the rude peer-review, 2020. DOI: [10.1007/s00264-020-04504-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00264-020-04504-1)
 65. J.C. Clements. Don't be a prig in peer review, 2020. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-020-02512-0](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-020-02512-0)
 66. J.A.T. da Silva. An Alert to COVID-19 Literature in Predatory Publishing Venues, 2020. DOI: [10.1016/j.acalib.2020.102187](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2020.102187)
 67. T.G. Gerwing; A.M.A. Gerwing; S. Avery-Gomm; et al. Quantifying professionalism in peer review, 2020. DOI: [10.1186/s41073-020-00096-x](https://doi.org/10.1186/s41073-020-00096-x)
 68. A. Severin; J. Martins; R. Heyard; et al. Gender and other potential biases in peer review: cross-sectional analysis of 38 250 external peer review reports, 2020. DOI: [10.1136/bmjopen-2019-035058](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2019-035058)
 69. S. Politzer-Ahles; T. Girolamo; S. Ghali. Preliminary evidence of linguistic bias in academic reviewing, 2020. DOI: [10.1016/j.jeap.2020.100895](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2020.100895)
 70. J.A.T. da Silva. Are negative reviews, predatory reviewers or failed peer review rewarded at Publons?, 2020. DOI: [10.1007/s00264-020-04587-w](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00264-020-04587-w)
 71. A.R. Memon; F.A. Rathore. The rising menace of scholarly black-market: Challenges and solutions for improving research in low- and middle-income countries, 2021. PMID: [34111064](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34111064/)
 72. S. Conix; A. De Block; K. Vaesen. Grant writing and grant peer review as questionable research practices, 2021. DOI: [10.12688/f1000research.73893.2](https://doi.org/10.12688/f1000research.73893.2)
 73. H. Rivera; J.A.T. da Silva. Retractions, Fake Peer Reviews, and Paper Mills, 2021. DOI: [10.3346/jkms.2021.36.e165](https://doi.org/10.3346/jkms.2021.36.e165)
 74. A.F. Jorm. Publons as a source of high volume, poorly targeted reviewer requests: The need for better standards of practice by publishers, 2021. DOI: [10.1002/leap.1420](https://doi.org/10.1002/leap.1420)
 75. P.R. Shankar. Recognizing and Rewarding Peer-reviewers, 2021. DOI: [10.46405/ejms.v3i2.353](https://doi.org/10.46405/ejms.v3i2.353)

76. A. Day. Exploratory analysis of text duplication in peer-review reveals peer-review fraud and paper mills, 2022. DOI: [10.1007/s11192-022-04504-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-022-04504-5)
77. K. Bell; P. Kingori; D. Mills. Scholarly Publishing, Boundary Processes, and the Problem of Fake Peer Reviews, 2022. DOI: [10.1177/01622439221112463](https://doi.org/10.1177/01622439221112463)
78. J.A.T. da Silva. ‘Tortured phrases’ in post-publication peer review of materials, computer and engineering sciences reveal linguistic-related editing problems, 2022. DOI: [10.48130/PR-2022-0006](https://doi.org/10.48130/PR-2022-0006)
79. O.B. Amaral. To fix peer review, break it into stages, 2022. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-022-03791-5](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-022-03791-5)
80. P. Gonzalez; G.S. Wilson; A.J. Purvis. Peer review in academic publishing: Challenges in achieving the gold standard, 2022. DOI: [10.53761/1.19.5.1](https://doi.org/10.53761/1.19.5.1)
81. W.C.G. Peh. Peer review: concepts, variants and controversies, 2022. DOI: [10.11622/smedj.2021139](https://doi.org/10.11622/smedj.2021139)
82. R. Schulz; A. Barnett; R. Bernard; et al. Is the future of peer review automated?, 2022. DOI: [10.1186/s13104-022-06080-6](https://doi.org/10.1186/s13104-022-06080-6)
83. J.B. Riding. An evaluation of the process of peer review, 2022. DOI: [10.1080/01916122.2022.2151052](https://doi.org/10.1080/01916122.2022.2151052)
84. J.A.T. da Silva; S. Nazarovets. The Role of Publons in the Context of Open Peer Review, 2022. DOI: [10.1007/s12109-022-09914-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12109-022-09914-0)
85. M. Petrescu; A.S. Krishen. The evolving crisis of the peer-review process, 2022. DOI: [10.1057/s41270-022-00176-5](https://doi.org/10.1057/s41270-022-00176-5)
86. F. Holst; K. Eggleton; S. Harris. Transparency versus anonymity: which is better to eliminate bias in peer review?, 2022. DOI: [10.1629/uksg.584](https://doi.org/10.1629/uksg.584)
87. J. Huber; S. Inoua; R. Kerschbamer; et al. Nobel and novice: Author prominence affects peer review, 2022. DOI: [10.1073/pnas.2205779119](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2205779119)
88. N.D. McKenzie; R. Liu; A.V. Chiu; et al. Exploring Bias in Scientific Peer Review: An ASCO Initiative, 2022. DOI: [10.1200/OP.22.00275](https://doi.org/10.1200/OP.22.00275)
89. M. Conklin; S. Singh. Triple-blind review as a solution to gender bias in academic publishing, a theoretical approach, 2022. DOI: [10.1080/03075079.2022.2081681](https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2022.2081681)
90. A.R. Kern-Goldberger; R. James; V. Berghella; E.S. Miller. The impact of double-blind peer review on gender bias in scientific publishing: a systematic review, 2022. DOI: [10.1016/j.ajog.2022.01.030](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajog.2022.01.030)
91. K.L. Karvonen; E.M. Bonachea; H.H. Burris; et al. Addressing bias and knowledge gaps regarding race and ethnicity in neonatology manuscript review, 2022. DOI: [10.1038/s41372-022-01420-7](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41372-022-01420-7)

92. N. Jones. Authors' names have 'astonishing' influence on peer reviewers, 2022. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-022-03256-9](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-022-03256-9)
93. D. Strauss; S. Gran-Ruaz; M. Osman; et al. Racism and censorship in the editorial and peer review process, 2023. DOI: [10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1120938](https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1120938)
94. C. Tropini; B.B. Finlay; M. Nichter; et al. Time to rethink academic publishing: the peer reviewer crisis, 2023. DOI: [10.1128/mbio.01091-23](https://doi.org/10.1128/mbio.01091-23)
95. A.G. LeBlanc; J.D. Barnes; T.J. Saunders; et al. Scientific sinkhole: estimating the cost of peer review based on survey data with snowball sampling, 2023. DOI: [10.1186/s41073-023-00128-2](https://doi.org/10.1186/s41073-023-00128-2)
96. A. Dance. Stop the peer-review treadmill. I want to get off, 2023. DOI: [10.1038_d41586-023-00403-8](https://doi.org/10.1038_d41586-023-00403-8)
97. Editorial. In praise of peer review, 2023. DOI: [10.1038/s41563-023-01661-7](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41563-023-01661-7)
98. G. Conroy. Scientific sleuths spot dishonest ChatGPT use in papers, 2023. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-023-02477-w](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-023-02477-w)
99. P.K. Bharti; M. Navlakha; M. Agarwal; A. Ekbal. PolitePEER: does peer review hurt? A dataset to gauge politeness intensity in the peer reviews, 2023. DOI: [10.1007/s10579-023-09662-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10579-023-09662-3)
100. X. Hu. Prejudice, Interests, Jealousy: Inappropriate Peer Reviewers May Be Exacerbating Inequality in Academic Publication in Health Research, 2023. DOI: [10.3346/jkms.2023.38.e256](https://doi.org/10.3346/jkms.2023.38.e256)
101. K. Kousha; M. Thelwall. Artificial intelligence to support publishing and peer review: A summary and review, 2023. DOI: [10.1002/leap.1570](https://doi.org/10.1002/leap.1570)
102. N. Gilbert. Anonymizing peer review makes the process more just, 2023. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-023-01772-w](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-023-01772-w)
103. P. Lor. Scholarly publishing and peer review in the Global South: the role of the reviewer, 2023. DOI: [10.36253/jlis.it-512](https://doi.org/10.36253/jlis.it-512)
104. S. Abdel-Razig; H. Ibrahim. Outsider bias: how your name influences the peer review process, 2023. DOI: [10.1136/pmj-2022-142046](https://doi.org/10.1136/pmj-2022-142046)
105. S. Balasubramanian; A. Simha. Peer Review Rings: Manipulated Peer Reviews and Scams, 2024. DOI: [10.1007/978-981-97-4060-4_21](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-97-4060-4_21)
106. D.E. Wright. Five problems plaguing publishing in the life sciences-and one common cause, 2024. DOI: [10.1002/1873-3468.15018](https://doi.org/10.1002/1873-3468.15018)
107. J.A. Drozd; M.R. Ladomery. The Peer Review Process: Past, Present, and Future, 2024. DOI: [10.3389/bjbs.2024.12054](https://doi.org/10.3389/bjbs.2024.12054)
108. K. Sasaki; Y. Yamada. Questionable Peer Review Practices, 2024.

[DOI: 10.32655/LIBRES.2024.1.4](#)

109. J. Brainard. Suspicious phrases in peer reviews point to referees gaming the system, 2024. [DOI: 10.1126/science.zz2zu81](#)
110. A. Maddi; L. Miotti. On the peer review reports: does size matter?, 2024. [DOI: 10.1007/s11192-024-04977-6](#)
111. D.S. Chawla. Is ChatGPT corrupting peer review? Telltale words hint at AI use, 2024. [DOI: 10.1038/d41586-024-01051-2](#)
112. S. Jecmen; N.B. Shah; F. Fang; L. Akoglu. On the Detection of Reviewer-Author Collusion Rings From Paper Bidding, 2024. [DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2402.07860](#)
113. M. Enserink. ‘It felt very icky’: This scientist’s name was used to write fake peer reviews, 2024. [DOI: 10.1126/science.z5ovm69](#)
114. C. Dyer. Peer review practices are "delaying science," academic claims in lawsuit against six publishers, 2024. [DOI: 10.1136/bmj.q2037](#)
115. J. Feinmann. ‘Substandard and unworthy’: why it’s time to banish bad-mannered reviews, 2024. [DOI: 10.1038/d41586-024-02943-z](#)
116. Z. Faulkes. Potential problems of paying peer reviewers, 2024. [DOI: 10.6084/m9.figshare.25746996](#)
117. M.A. Oviedo-Garcia. The review mills, not just (self-)plagiarism in review reports, but a step further, 2024. [DOI: 10.1007/s11192-024-05125-w](#)
118. V. Mollaki. Death of a reviewer or death of peer review integrity? the challenges of using AI tools in peer reviewing and the need to go beyond publishing policies, 2024. [DOI: 10.1177/17470161231224552](#)
119. M. Piniewski; I. Jaric; D. Koutsoyiannis; Z.W. Kundzewicz. Emerging plagiarism in peer-review evaluation reports: a tip of the iceberg?, 2024. [DOI: 10.1007/s11192-024-04960-1](#)
120. H. Else. ‘Getting paid to review is justice’: journal pays peer reviewers in cryptocurrency, 2024. [DOI: 10.1038/d41586-024-04027-4](#)
121. J.B.O. Neto. The challenge of reviewers scarcity in academic journals: payment as a viable solution, 2024. [DOI: 10.31744/einstein_journal/2024ED1194](#)
122. H. Bauchner; F.P. Rivara. Use of artificial intelligence and the future of peer review, 2024. [DOI: 10.1093/haschl/qxae058](#)
123. M.L. Seghier. AI-powered peer review needs human supervision, 2024. [DOI: 10.1108/JICES-09-2024-0132](#)
124. L. Fiorillo; V. Mehta. Accelerating editorial processes in scientific journals: Leveraging AI for rapid manuscript review, 2024. [DOI: 10.1016/j.oor.2024.100511](#)

125. D. von Wedel; R.A. Schmitt; M. Thiele; et al. Affiliation Bias in Peer Review of Abstracts by a Large Language Model, 2024. DOI: [10.1001/jama.2023.24641](https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2023.24641)
126. Z. Sun; K.L. Pang; Y. Li. The fading of status bias during the open peer review process, 2024. DOI: [10.1016/j.joi.2024.101528](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2024.101528)
127. S. Schneider; C. Morgan; C. Magill; et al. Evidence review: Peer review bias in the funding process: Main themes and interventions, 2024. DOI: [10.17861/YDDH-B137](https://doi.org/10.17861/YDDH-B137)
128. G. Curfman. Publishers face antitrust lawsuit with potential implications for peer review, duplicate submission, and dissemination practices, 2025. DOI: [10.1093/haschl/qxaf018](https://doi.org/10.1093/haschl/qxaf018)
129. R. Horchani. Impact of institutional affiliation bias in the peer review process, 2025. DOI: [10.1629/uksg.681](https://doi.org/10.1629/uksg.681)
130. H. Else. Publishers trial paying peer reviewers - what did they find?, 2025. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-025-00968-6](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-025-00968-6)
131. I. Glendinning; S. Bjelobaba; S. Razi; et al. Is Peer Review Fit for Purpose? Enhancing Integrity and Professional Standards in Publications, 2025. DOI: [10.18552/joaw.v15iS1.1069](https://doi.org/10.18552/joaw.v15iS1.1069)
132. A. Goldberg; I. Stelmakh; K. Cho; et al. Peer reviews of peer reviews: A randomized controlled trial and other experiments, 2025. DOI: [10.1371/journal.pone.0320444](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0320444)
133. A.G. Woldeamanuel. Peer review: A highly valuable service but less recognized, 2025. DOI: [10.1186/s13731-025-00479-8](https://doi.org/10.1186/s13731-025-00479-8)
134. E. Picano. Who is a reviewer? The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly phenotypes, 2025. DOI: [10.37349/ec.2025.101248](https://doi.org/10.37349/ec.2025.101248)
135. M. Naddaf. AI is transforming peer review - and many scientists are worried, 2025. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-025-00894-7](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-025-00894-7)
136. Z. Zhuang; J. Chen; H. Xu; et al. Large language models for automated scholarly paper review: A survey, 2025. DOI: [10.1016/j.inffus.2025.103332](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.inffus.2025.103332)
137. D. Gruda. Three AI-powered steps to faster, smarter peer review, 2025. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-025-00526-0](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-025-00526-0)
138. S. Farber. Comparing human and AI expertise in the academic peer review process: towards a hybrid approach, 2025. DOI: [10.1080/07294360.2024.2445575](https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2024.2445575)
139. N.L. Vecchio. Personal experience with AI-generated peer reviews: a case study, 2025. DOI: [10.1186/s41073-025-00161-3](https://doi.org/10.1186/s41073-025-00161-3)
140. A.S. BaHammam. Peer Review in the Artificial Intelligence Era: A Call for Developing Responsible Integration Guidelines, 2025. DOI: [10.2147/NSS.S513872](https://doi.org/10.2147/NSS.S513872)
141. The Lancet Global Health. Artificial-intelligence-based peer reviewing: opportunity or

- threat?, 2025. DOI: [10.1016/S2214-109X\(25\)00070-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X(25)00070-1)
142. E.C.P. Patron; J.D.E. Arcelles. Conflict of Interests Regarding Peer Review: Bias in Manuscript Rejection, 2025. DOI: [10.30958/ajss.12-1-1](https://doi.org/10.30958/ajss.12-1-1)
 143. [Hindawi concludes in-depth investigation into peer review fraud.](#)
 144. [On the Mark? Responses to a Sting.](#)
 145. [Journal Editor Resigns Over Contrarian Climate Paper.](#)
 146. [Journal editor resigns over ‘flawed’ paper co-authored by climate sceptic.](#)
 147. [Peer-Review is Censorship not Quality Control.](#)
 148. [Wiley and Hindawi to retract 1,200 more papers for compromised peer review.](#)
 149. [Exclusive: Hindawi and Wiley to retract over 500 papers linked to peer review rings.](#)
 150. [Peer review is essential to good science - it’s time to credit expert reviewers.](#)
 151. [Nature News reports SCIdgen gibberish papers; can we rely on conventional peer-review? Or can machines help?.](#)
 152. [Fake peer review and paid authorship in Educational Technology research.](#)
 153. [Should we be worried about plagiarism in peer review?.](#)
 154. [When scientists lie.](#)
 155. [A fraud accusation like nothing you’ve seen before.](#)
 156. [We should reward peer reviewers. But how?.](#)
 157. [Conflict of Interest in Peer-Reviewed Medical Journals.](#)
 158. [BioMed Central retracting 43 papers for fake peer review.](#)
 159. [Major publisher retracts 43 scientific papers amid wider fake peer-review scandal.](#)
 160. [60 Articles Retracted After Probe of ‘Peer Review Ring’.](#)
 161. [Rewarding Reviewers: Money, Prestige, or Some of Both?.](#)
 162. [The rise and fall of peer review.](#)
 163. [Major Science Publisher Admits "Fabricated" Peer Reviews.](#)
 164. [Major publisher retracts 43 scientific papers amid wider fake peer-review scandal.](#)
 165. [Who pays the price for peer review?.](#)
 166. [Questionable peer review practice in top-tier journal.](#)
 167. [Questionable Journal Review Practices.](#)
 168. [What’s in a Name: Fictitious Authors in Science.](#)
 169. [Academic journals are facing a battle to weed out fake peer reviews.](#)
 170. [Peer Review: Practices and Controversies.](#)
 171. [Fake peer-reviewing.](#)
 172. [Rogue peer review - a polysemy in the making.](#)

173. [How to recognise potential manipulation of the peer review process.](#)
174. [Do you feel that peer-review has become so biased that it is allowing poor quality work from some of the more famous research groups to be published without scrutiny?.](#)
175. [Why Peer Reviewing Is More Difficult These Days.](#)
176. [What Is a Peer Review and Citation Ring?.](#)
177. [Academic journal retracts articles over ‘peer review ring’ with bogus scholars.](#)
178. [Perils of Peer Review.](#)
179. [Should authors be encouraged to pick their own peer reviewers?.](#)
180. [Collusion Rings Threaten the Integrity of Computer Science Research.](#)
181. [Fake Peer Review Leads to Massive Retractions.](#)
182. [SAGE Publications busts "peer review and citation ring," 60 papers retracted.](#)
183. [Scholarly journal retracts 60 articles, smashes ‘peer review ring’.](#)
184. [Here’s how competition makes peer review more unfair.](#)
185. [A fraud accusation like nothing you’ve seen before.](#)
186. [What’s next for peer review?.](#)
187. [Peer review in 2015: A global view: A white paper from Taylor & Francis.](#)
188. [The Perils of Peer Review.](#)
189. [Exposing the Dark Side of Peer Review.](#)
190. [Peer review is meant to prevent scientific misconduct. But it has its own problems.](#)
191. [Scientists reportedly hiding AI text prompts in academic papers to receive positive peer reviews.](#)
192. [Review mills identified as a new form of peer-review fraud.](#)
193. [What do you do if you suspect that a peer-reviewer has stolen some materials and ideas \(without correct citation and disclosure of being reviewer\) from your manuscript to publish a paper similar to yours?.](#)
194. [Peer review, fake knowledge, and the quest for simple and useful science.](#)
195. [Manipulating the peer review process: why it happens and how it might be prevented.](#)
196. [Bio journal retracts 107 Chinese research papers: Fake peer reviews cited; uproar reignites questions of credibility.](#)
197. [Scientists scammed at least 110 academic papers into publication using fake peer reviews.](#)
198. [Fake Peer Review? Leading journal in robotics retracts six papers from Chinese academics after concluding the process had been subverted.](#)
199. [Peer Review: The Worst Way to Judge Research, Except for All the Others.](#)
200. [Time to lift the veil on peer review.](#)

201. [Fake peer review and paid authorship in Educational Technology research: The dark underbelly of scientific publishing pt.1.](#)
202. [Peer Review Has Lost Its Human Face. So, What's Next?.](#)
203. [Ask the Chefs: What is the Single Most Pressing Issue for the Future of Peer Review?.](#)
204. [Cry from Publons: Let's End Reviewer Fraud.](#)
205. [Where next in peer review? Part 1: COPE commentary.](#)
206. [Scholarly Peer Review is an Age-Old Practice, But Publishing is Changing.](#)
207. [Rewarding peer reviewers: a problem of adverse selection?.](#)
208. [Unhelpful, caustic and slow: the academic community should rethink the way publications are reviewed.](#)
209. [Peer review: bad with it, worse without it.](#)
210. [Peer review is frustrating and flawed - here's how we can fix it.](#)
211. [Controversial Aspects of Peer-Review.](#)
212. [Reviewer misconduct?.](#)
213. [Addressing Reviewer Misconduct in Scholarly Publishing: MDPI's Proactive Steps.](#)
214. ["I am really sorry:" Peer reviewer stole text for own paper.](#)
215. [Is peer review confidentiality overridden when the author is suspected of misconduct?.](#)
216. [Peerage of Science.](#)
217. [Plagiarism Found in Peer-Review Reports Sparks Concerns of Widespread Misconduct.](#)
218. [The case against Revise and Resubmit.](#)
219. [Academic publishing and the \(hidden\) dynamics of censorship.](#)
220. [Peer-Review is Censorship not Quality Control.](#)
221. [Is peer-review censorship or necessary evil?.](#)
222. [Peer Review Does Private, Elite Gatekeeping.](#)
223. [Fuck Peer-Reviewed Publications, No Offence.](#)
224. [The perils of academic publishing.](#)
225. [Publisher discovers 50 manuscripts involving fake peer reviewers.](#)
226. [The Peer Review Scam: How authors are reviewing their own papers.](#)
227. [Retractions Due to Fake Peer Reviews.](#)
228. [Fake peer review hits RSC journals.](#)
229. [Science Journal Pulls 60 Papers in Peer-Review Fraud.](#)
230. [Searching for Misconduct and Paper Mills in Peer Review Comments.](#)
231. [Dear peer reviewer, you stole my paper: An author's worst nightmare.](#)
232. [When Peer Reviewers Steal.](#)
233. [Technical or peer reviewers stealing research ideas from the authors of the paper they](#)

review.

234. The peer review system no longer works to guarantee academic rigour - a different approach is needed.
235. Suspecting a reviewer of idea theft?.
236. Possible peer review manipulation.
237. Transparent Peer Review Service on ScholarOne.
238. Reviewer accused of stealing manuscript and publishing it as his own denies he refereed it.
239. How to address very rude and unconstructive peer review report?.
240. How to deal with crazy comments from peers (video).
241. Handling a rude author as a reviewer?.
242. Mean peer reviewers.
243. 'Peer-Review'? Not So Much Really.
244. Is it normal to get an angry review that does not address any point of the work?.
245. 'Rude' peer reviews inflict most damage on women and minorities.
246. How to handle an idiotic review.
247. The cruel reviewer.
248. Paper mills and Review mills.
249. Who's Afraid of Reviewer #2?.
250. How To Identify a Doctor No Peer Review.
251. What's Wrong with Paying for Peer Review?.
252. Why is peer-review so mean? A culture of criticism can quickly become a culture of cruelty.
253. How Sneaky Researchers Are Using Hidden AI Prompts to Influence the Peer Review Process.
254. Finding peer reviewers 'getting harder and harder'.
255. The abuse of peer review and its discontents.
256. Plagiarism in Peer Review: A Serious Threat to Academic Integrity.
257. What do you think about publons.com which keeps track of your peer-review work?.
258. What do you think about Publons? Does it have any value?.
259. Guest Post: What a new Publons Report on Peer Review Says About Diversity, and More.
260. Papermills in peer-review.
261. How to find evidence of paper mills using peer review comments.
262. Safeguarding peer review in the era of evolving paper mills.

263. [Affiliation bias in peer review favours male authors - study.](#)
264. [Searching for Misconduct and Paper Mills in Peer-Review Comments.](#)
265. [Weekend reads: An authorship dispute goes to court; peer review mills; falsely accused of using ChatGPT to write a paper.](#)
266. [Peer review rigging: Should authors be allowed to suggest peer reviewers?.](#)
267. ["Peer Review is Broken".](#)
268. [Peer reviewers accused of nepotism.](#)
269. [Credit for Peer Review: What is it Worth?.](#)
270. [Double-anonymous review is an effective way of combating status bias in scholarly publishing .](#)
271. [Is the peer review process flawed for academic articles?.](#)
272. [Psychological Research: Racial Biases in the Peer-review and Publishing Enterprise.](#)
273. [The problems with peer review.](#)
274. [The Fractured Logic of Blinded Peer Review in Journals.](#)
275. [From annoying to bitter, here are the six types of peer reviewers.](#)
276. [The perils of peer review: Savage reviews can be devastating for graduate students. What lies at their root?.](#)
277. [Mieke Bal: Let's Abolish the Peer-Review System.](#)
278. [How peer review became so easy to exploit by AI.](#)
279. [AAAI Launches AI-Powered Peer Review Assessment System.](#)
280. [AI in Peer Review: A Recipe for Disaster or Success?.](#)
281. [Why is peer review taking so long?.](#)
282. [Should I accept review requests from dubious journals?.](#)
283. [Academic Peer-Reviews Are Heavily Influenced by 'Status-bias': Study.](#)
284. [Gender bias in peer review - Opening up the black box II.](#)
285. [Gender Bias in Peer Review: An Interview with Brooks Hanson and Jory Lerback.](#)
286. [Sunlight not shadows: Double-anonymised peer review is not the answer to status bias.](#)
287. [The Ethics of AI in Peer Review: Ensuring Fairness and Transparency in Academic Publishing.](#)
288. [Predatory publishing: Favoritism and self-promotion pollute peer review.](#)
289. [What's in a name? Bias in peer review.](#)
290. [What are the barriers to post-publication peer review?.](#)
291. [Peer review bias in the funding process.](#)
292. [Systematic Discrimination in Peer Review: Some Reflections \(guest post by by Kyle Powys Whyte\).](#)

293. [PhD supervisors asking their students to review papers on their behalf.](#)
294. [Reimagining peer review: a case for innovation.](#)

7 Bias and Disparity in Academic Publishing

1. J.M. Stern; R.J. Simes. Publication bias: evidence of delayed publication in a cohort study of clinical research projects, 1997. DOI: [10.1136/bmj.315.7109.640](#)
2. C.M. Olson; D. Rennie; D. Cook; et al. Publication Bias in Editorial Decision Making, 2002. DOI: [10.1001/jama.287.21.2825](#)
3. A.W. Jorgensen; J. Hilden; P.C. Gotzsche. Cochrane reviews compared with industry supported meta-analyses and other meta-analyses of the same drugs: systematic review, 2006. DOI: [10.1136/bmj.38973.444699.0B](#)
4. K. Lee; P. Bacchetti; I. Sim. Publication of Clinical Trials Supporting Successful New Drug Applications: A Literature Analysis, 2008. DOI: [10.1371/journal.pmed.0050191](#)
5. L. Bornmann; H.-D. Daniel. Reviewer and editor biases in journal peer review: an investigation of manuscript refereeing at Angewandte Chemie International Edition, 2009. DOI: [10.3152/095820209X477520](#)
6. J.P.A. Ioannidis. Excess Significance Bias in the Literature on Brain Volume Abnormalities, 2011. DOI: [10.1001/archgenpsychiatry.2011.28](#)
7. R. Joobar; N. Schmitz; L. Annable; P. Boksa. Publication bias: What are the challenges and can they be overcome?, 2012. DOI: [10.1503/jpn.120065](#)
8. G. ter Riet; D.A. Korevaar; M. Leenaars; et al. Publication Bias in Laboratory Animal Research: A Survey on Magnitude, Drivers, Consequences and Potential Solutions, 2012. DOI: [10.1371/journal.pone.0043404](#)
9. K.K. Tsilidis; O.A. Panagiotou; E.S. Sena; et al. Evaluation of Excess Significance Bias in Animal Studies of Neurological Diseases, 2013. DOI: [10.1371/journal.pbio.1001609](#)
10. A.A. van der Schot; C. Phillips. Publication Bias in Animal Welfare Scientific Literature, 2013. DOI: [10.1007/s10806-012-9433-8](#)
11. J.M. Chase. The Shadow of Bias, 2013. DOI: [10.1371/journal.pbio.1001608](#)
12. R. Dunn Jr. The Age Bias in Academic Publishing, 2014. DOI: [10.1080/05775132.2005.11034316](#)
13. K.S. Button; L. Bal; A. Clark; T. Shipley. Preventing the ends from justifying the means: withholding results to address publication bias in peer-review, 2016. DOI: [10.1186/s40359-016-0167-7](#)

14. K. Hyland. Academic publishing and the myth of linguistic injustice, 2016. DOI: [10.1016/j.jslw.2016.01.005](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2016.01.005)
15. A.W. Brown; T.S. Mehta; D.B. Allison. Publication Bias in Science: What Is It, Why Is It Problematic, and How Can It Be Addressed?, 2017. DOI: [10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190497620.013.10](https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190497620.013.10)
16. U. Conradi; A.R. Joffe. Publication bias in animal research presented at the 2008 Society of Critical Care Medicine Conference, 2017. DOI: [10.1186/s13104-017-2574-0](https://doi.org/10.1186/s13104-017-2574-0)
17. Y. Reingewertz; C. Lutmar. Academic in-group bias: An empirical examination of the link between author and journal affiliation, 2018. DOI: [10.1016/j.joi.2017.11.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2017.11.006)
18. J. Lundine; I.L. Bourgeault; J. Clark; et al. The gendered system of academic publishing, 2018. DOI: [10.1016/S0140-6736\(18\)30950-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(18)30950-4)
19. J.R. Boynton; K. Georgiou; M. Reid; A. Govus. Gender bias in publishing, 2018. DOI: [10.1016/S0140-6736\(18\)32000-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(18)32000-2)
20. R. Heesen. When journal editors play favorites, 2018. DOI: [10.1007/s11098-017-0895-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11098-017-0895-4)
21. M.H. Murad; H. Chu; L. Lin; Z. Wang. The effect of publication bias magnitude and direction on the certainty in evidence, 2018. DOI: [10.1136/bmjebm-2018-110891](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjebm-2018-110891)
22. J. Sharma; D.N. Poole. Gender bias in publishing, 2018. DOI: [10.1016/S0140-6736\(18\)31998-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(18)31998-6)
23. R. Morgan; K. Hawkins; J. Lundine. The foundation and consequences of gender bias in grant peer review processes, 2018. DOI: [10.1503/cmaj.180188](https://doi.org/10.1503/cmaj.180188)
24. B.K. Fabian-Jessing; M.F. Vallentin; N. Secher; et al. Animal models of cardiac arrest: A systematic review of bias and reporting, 2018. DOI: [10.1016/j.resuscitation.2018.01.047](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.resuscitation.2018.01.047)
25. J. Lundine; I.L. Bourgeault; K. Glonti; et al. "I don't see gender": Conceptualizing a gendered system of academic publishing, 2019. DOI: [10.1016/j.socscimed.2019.112388](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2019.112388)
26. J.K. Silver. Medical journals must tackle gender bias, 2019. DOI: [10.1136/bmj.l5888](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.l5888)
27. H. Sharma; S. Verma. Is positive publication bias really a bias, or an intentionally created discrimination toward negative results?, 2019. DOI: [10.4103/sja.SJA_124_19](https://doi.org/10.4103/sja.SJA_124_19)
28. A. Marks-Anglin; Y. Chen. A historical review of publication bias, 2020. DOI: [10.1002/jrsm.1452](https://doi.org/10.1002/jrsm.1452)
29. A. Drieschova. Failure, persistence, luck and bias in academic publishing, 2020. DOI: [10.1177/2336825X20911792](https://doi.org/10.1177/2336825X20911792)
30. J.D. Dworkin; K.A. Linn; E.G. Teich; et al. The extent and drivers of gender imbalance in neuroscience reference lists, 2020. DOI: [10.1038/s41593-020-0658-y](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41593-020-0658-y)
31. M. Skopec; H. Issa; J. Reed; M. Harris. The role of geographic bias in knowledge diffusion: a systematic review and narrative synthesis, 2020.

DOI: [10.1186/s41073-019-0088-0](https://doi.org/10.1186/s41073-019-0088-0)

32. M. Thelwall; A. Mas-Bleda. A gender equality paradox in academic publishing: Countries with a higher proportion of female first-authored journal articles have larger first-author gender disparities between fields, 2020. DOI: [10.1162/qss_a_00050](https://doi.org/10.1162/qss_a_00050)
33. A.A. Ayorinde; I. Williams; R. Mannion; et al. Publication and related biases in health services research: a systematic review of empirical evidence, 2020. DOI: [10.1186/s12874-020-01010-1](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-020-01010-1)
34. K. Jaakkola; J.N. Bruck; R.C. Connor; et al. Bias and Misrepresentation of Science Undermines Productive Discourse on Animal Welfare Policy: A Case Study, 2020. DOI: [10.3390/ani10071118](https://doi.org/10.3390/ani10071118)
35. S. Politzer-Ahles; T. Girolamo; S. Ghali. Preliminary evidence of linguistic bias in academic reviewing, 2020. DOI: [10.1016/j.jeap.2020.100895](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2020.100895)
36. V. Ramírez-Castaneda. Disadvantages in preparing and publishing scientific papers caused by the dominance of the English language in science: The case of Colombian researchers in biological sciences, 2020. DOI: [10.1371/journal.pone.0238372](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0238372)
37. A. Scanff; F. Naudet; I.A. Cristea; et al. A survey of biomedical journals to detect editorial bias and nepotistic behavior, 2021. DOI: [10.1371/journal.pbio.3001133](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.3001133)
38. H. Zhu. Home country bias in academic publishing: A case study of the New England Journal of Medicine, 2021. DOI: [10.1002/leap.1404](https://doi.org/10.1002/leap.1404)
39. Editorial. Confronting gender bias in Nature’s journalism, 2021. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-021-01676-7](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-021-01676-7)
40. J. Rouan; G. Velazquez; J. Freischlag; M.R. Kibbe. Publication bias is the consequence of a lack of diversity, equity, and inclusion, 2021. DOI: [10.1016/j.jvs.2021.03.049](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvs.2021.03.049)
41. R.H. Pickler; C.L. Munro; F.E. Likis. Addressing racism in editorial practices, 2021. DOI: [10.1111/nae2.11](https://doi.org/10.1111/nae2.11)
42. D.R. Avery; Darren K. B; T.L. Dumas; et al. Racial Biases in the Publication Process: Exploring Expressions and Solutions, 2021. DOI: [10.1177/01492063211030561](https://doi.org/10.1177/01492063211030561)
43. M. Kowal; P. Sorokowski; E. Kulczycki; A. Zelazniewicz. The impact of geographical bias when judging scientific studies, 2021. DOI: [10.1007/s11192-021-04176-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-021-04176-7)
44. B.G. Farrar; L. Ostojic; N.S. Clayton. The hidden side of animal cognition research: Scientists’ attitudes toward bias, replicability and scientific practice, 2021. DOI: [10.1371/journal.pone.0256607](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0256607)
45. C. Rovira; L. Codina; C. Lopezosa. Language Bias in the Google Scholar Ranking Algorithm, 2021. DOI: [10.3390/fi13020031](https://doi.org/10.3390/fi13020031)
46. A.M. Scheel; M.R.M.J. Schijen; D. Lakens. An Excess of Positive Results: Comparing

- the Standard Psychology Literature With Registered Reports, 2021.
DOI: [10.1177/25152459211007467](https://doi.org/10.1177/25152459211007467)
47. I. Sverdlichenko; S. Xie; E. Margolin. Impact of institutional affiliation bias on editorial publication decisions: A bibliometric analysis of three ophthalmology journals, 2022.
DOI: [10.1016/j.jemep.2022.100758](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jemep.2022.100758)
 48. G. Tang; H. Cai; J. Jia. Status bias in Chinese scholarly publishing: an exploratory study based on mixed methods, 2022. DOI: [10.1080/08989621.2022.2117621](https://doi.org/10.1080/08989621.2022.2117621)
 49. R. Palladino; R. Alfano; M. Moccia; et al. Association Between Institutional Affiliations of Academic Editors and Authors in Medical Journals, 2022.
DOI: [10.1007/s11606-022-07483-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-022-07483-8)
 50. N.D. McKenzie; R. Liu; A.V. Chiu; et al. Exploring Bias in Scientific Peer Review: An ASCO Initiative, 2022. DOI: [10.1200/OP.22.00275](https://doi.org/10.1200/OP.22.00275)
 51. M. Conklin; S. Singh. Triple-blind review as a solution to gender bias in academic publishing, a theoretical approach, 2022. DOI: [10.1080/03075079.2022.2081681](https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2022.2081681)
 52. F. Bransch; M. Kvasnicka. Male Gatekeepers: Gender Bias in the Publishing Process?, 2022. DOI: [10.1016/j.jebo.2022.07.031](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2022.07.031)
 53. E.R. Palser; M. Lazerwitz; A. Fotopoulou. Gender and geographical disparity in editorial boards of journals in psychology and neuroscience, 2022.
DOI: [10.1038/s41593-022-01012-w](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41593-022-01012-w)
 54. A.R. Kern-Goldberger; R. James; V. Berghella; E.S. Miller. The impact of double-blind peer review on gender bias in scientific publishing: a systematic review, 2022. DOI: [10.1016/j.ajog.2022.01.030](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajog.2022.01.030)
 55. K.L. Karvonen; E.M. Bonachea; H.H. Burris; et al. Addressing bias and knowledge gaps regarding race and ethnicity in neonatology manuscript review, 2022.
DOI: [10.1038/s41372-022-01420-7](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41372-022-01420-7)
 56. H.R. Hatfield; S.J. (Grace) Ahn; M. Klein; K.L. Nowak. Confronting whiteness through virtual humans: a review of 20 years of research in prejudice and racial bias using virtual environments, 2022. DOI: [10.1093/jcmc/zmac016](https://doi.org/10.1093/jcmc/zmac016)
 57. P. Sebo. Publication and citation inequalities faced by African researchers, 2022. DOI: [10.1016/j.ejim.2022.08.014](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejim.2022.08.014)
 58. L. Tutuncu; R. Yucedogru; I. Sarisoy. Academic favoritism at work: insider bias in Turkish national journals, 2022. DOI: [10.1007/s11192-022-04355-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-022-04355-0)
 59. J. Huber; S. Inoua; R. Kerschbamer; et al. Nobel and novice: Author prominence affects peer review, 2022. DOI: [10.1073/pnas.2205779119](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2205779119)
 60. N. Jones. Authors' names have 'astonishing' influence on peer reviewers, 2022. DOI:

[10.1038/d41586-022-03256-9](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-022-03256-9)

61. S.F. Gordon; E.G. Fierros. Combatting Exclusionary Language Practices in Science Publishing: A DEI Concern, 2022. DOI: [10.36591/SE-D-4503-84](https://doi.org/10.36591/SE-D-4503-84)
62. K. Komukai; S. Sugita; S. Fujimoto. Publication Bias and Selective Outcome Reporting in Randomized Controlled Trials Related to Rehabilitation: A Literature Review, 2023. DOI: [10.1016/j.apmr.2023.06.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmr.2023.06.006)
63. Editorial. How to curb bias in manuscript assessments, 2023. DOI: [10.1038/s41551-023-01104-3](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41551-023-01104-3)
64. J.A. Bol; A. Sheffel; N. Zia; A. Meghani. How to address the geographical bias in academic publishing, 2023. DOI: [10.1136/bmjgh-2023-013111](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2023-013111)
65. A. Rubin; E. Rubin; D. Segal. Editor home bias?, 2023. DOI: [10.1016/j.respol.2023.104766](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2023.104766)
66. N. Rinaldo; G. Piva; S. Ryder; et al. The Issue of Gender Bias Represented in Authorship in the Fields of Exercise and Rehabilitation: A 5-Year Research in Indexed Journals, 2023. DOI: [10.3390/jfmr8010018](https://doi.org/10.3390/jfmr8010018)
67. T.S. Malkinson; D.B. Terhune; M. Kollamkulam; et al. Gender imbalances in the editorial activities of a selective journal run by academic editors, 2023. DOI: [10.1371/journal.pone.0294805](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0294805)
68. I. Basson; C. Ni; G. Badia; et al. Gender differences in submission behavior exacerbate publication disparities in elite journals, 2023. DOI: [10.7554/eLife.90049.1.sa4](https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.90049.1.sa4)
69. A. Heidt. Racial inequalities in journals highlighted in giant study, 2023. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-023-01457-4](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-023-01457-4)
70. S. Mustaj; A. De Cassai; G. Spolverato; et al. Examining gender bias in regional anesthesia academic publishing: a 50-year bibliometric analysis, 2023. DOI: [10.1186/s44158-023-00137-z](https://doi.org/10.1186/s44158-023-00137-z)
71. V.L. Watts; P. Sweet; P. Odai-Afotey; et al. A seat for all: Advancing racial equity in scholarly publishing of health policy and health services research, 2023. DOI: [10.1002/leap.1531](https://doi.org/10.1002/leap.1531)
72. M. Formanowicz; M. Witkowska; W. Hryniskak; et al. Gender bias in special issues: evidence from a bibliometric analysis, 2023. DOI: [10.1007/s11192-023-04639-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-023-04639-z)
73. N. Lawson. What citation tests really tell us about bias in academic publishing, 2023. DOI: [10.1016/j.euroecorev.2023.104534](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euroecorev.2023.104534)
74. P. Sebo; J. Schwarz. The level of the gender gap in academic publishing varies by country and region of affiliation: A cross-sectional study of articles published in general medical journals, 2023. DOI: [10.1371/journal.pone.0291837](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0291837)

75. C.E. Krebs; A. Lam; J. McCarthy; et al. A survey to assess animal methods bias in scientific publishing, 2023. DOI: [10.14573/altex.2210212](https://doi.org/10.14573/altex.2210212)
76. S. Abdel-Razig; H. Ibrahim. Outsider bias: how your name influences the peer review process, 2023. DOI: [10.1136/pmj-2022-142046](https://doi.org/10.1136/pmj-2022-142046)
77. C.E. Krebs; C. Camp; H. Constantino; et al. Proceedings of a workshop to address animal methods bias in scientific publishing, 2023. DOI: [10.14573/altex.2210211](https://doi.org/10.14573/altex.2210211)
78. C.E. Krebs; C. Camp; H. Constantino; et al. Author Guide for Addressing Animal Methods Bias in Publishing, 2023. DOI: [10.1002/adv.202303226](https://doi.org/10.1002/adv.202303226)
79. Editorial. Scientific publishing has a language problem, 2023. DOI: [10.1038/s41562-023-01679-6](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-023-01679-6)
80. U. Peters. Linguistic Discrimination in Science: Can English Disfluency Help Debias Scientific Research?, 2023. DOI: [10.1080/02698595.2023.2251676](https://doi.org/10.1080/02698595.2023.2251676)
81. D. von Wedel; R.A. Schmitt; M. Thiele; et al. Affiliation Bias in Peer Review of Abstracts by a Large Language Model, 2024. DOI: [10.1001/jama.2023.24641](https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2023.24641)
82. G. Fontanarrosa; L. Zarba; V. Aschero; et al. Over twenty years of publications in Ecology: Over-contribution of women reveals a new dimension of gender bias, 2024. DOI: [10.1371/journal.pone.0307813](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0307813)
83. M. Loui; S.C. Fiala. Inequities in Academic Publishing: Where Is the Evidence and What Can Be Done?, 2024. DOI: [10.2105/AJPH.2024.307587](https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2024.307587)
84. A. Ledgerwood; K.M. Lawson; M.W. Kraus; et al. Disrupting Racism and Global Exclusion in Academic Publishing: Recommendations and Resources for Authors, Reviewers, and Editors, 2024. DOI: [10.1525/collabra.121394](https://doi.org/10.1525/collabra.121394)
85. S.L. Auelua-Toomey; E. Mortenson; S.O. Roberts. Reducing racial bias in scientific communication: Journal policies and their influence on reporting racial demographics, 2024. DOI: [10.1037/amp0001310](https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0001310)
86. H. Arenas-Castro; V. Berdejo-Espinola; S. Chowdhury; et al. Academic publishing requires linguistically inclusive policies, 2024. DOI: [10.1098/rspb.2023.2840](https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2023.2840)
87. R. Mathur; G. Bhatia. Nepotism in academic publishing: The elephant in the room, 2024. DOI: [10.1016/j.ajp.2023.103854](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajp.2023.103854)
88. S. Gonzalez-Dambrauskas; J.I.F. Salluh; F.R. Machado; A.T. Rotta. Science over language: a plea to consider language bias in scientific publishing, 2024. DOI: [10.62675/2965-2774.20240084-en](https://doi.org/10.62675/2965-2774.20240084-en)
89. C.E. Krebs; K. Herrmann. Confronting the bias towards animal experimentation (animal methods bias), 2024. DOI: [10.3389/fddsv.2024.1347798](https://doi.org/10.3389/fddsv.2024.1347798)
90. O. Kavanagh; C.E. Krebs. Mitigating animal methods bias to reduce animal use and

- improve biomedical translation, 2024. DOI: [10.1177/00368504241253693](https://doi.org/10.1177/00368504241253693)
91. Y.A. Adebisi; N.D. Jimoh; I.O. Ogunkola; et al. Addressing language inequities in global health science scholarly publishing, 2024. DOI: [10.1016/j.glmedi.2023.100038](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.glmedi.2023.100038)
 92. C. Drummond. The linguistic landscape of scholarly publishing: Quantifying language bias through Multiple Systems Estimation, 2024. DOI: [10.17615/ggvw-bk80](https://doi.org/10.17615/ggvw-bk80)
 93. T. Naidu; C. Cartmill; S. Swanepoel; C.R. Whitehead. Shapeshifters: Global South scholars and their tensions in border-crossing to Global North journals, 2024. DOI: [10.1136/bmjgh-2023-014420](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjgh-2023-014420)
 94. R. Neveu; A. Neveu. Reputation shortcoming in academic publishing, 2025. DOI: [10.1371/journal.pone.0322012](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0322012)
 95. G. Zhang; L. Wang; Y. Yin; X. Wang. Author academic influence and manuscript acceptance: Evidence from peer review in cell press journals, 2025. DOI: [10.1080/08989621.2025.2521083](https://doi.org/10.1080/08989621.2025.2521083)
 96. R. Horchani. Impact of institutional affiliation bias in the peer review process, 2025. DOI: [10.1629/uksg.681](https://doi.org/10.1629/uksg.681)
 97. E.C.P. Patron; J.D.E. Arcelles. Conflict of Interests Regarding Peer Review: Bias in Manuscript Rejection, 2025. DOI: [10.30958/ajss.12-1-1](https://doi.org/10.30958/ajss.12-1-1)
 98. L. Bowker; M. Laakso; J. Polonen. Breaking the Silence on Linguistic and Gender Bias in Scholarly Publishing: What Can Librarians Do?, 2025. DOI: [10.2139/ssrn.5141785](https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5141785)
 99. A. Gayet-Ageron; K. Ben Messaoud; M. Richards; et al. Gender and geographical bias in the editorial decision-making process of biomedical journals: a case-control study, 2025. DOI: [10.1136/bmjebm-2024-113083](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjebm-2024-113083)
 100. A. Kulal; N. Abhishek; P. Shareena; S. Dinesh. Unmasking Favoritism and Bias in Academic Publishing: An Empirical Study on Editorial Practices, 2025. DOI: [10.1080/10999922.2024.2448875](https://doi.org/10.1080/10999922.2024.2448875)
 101. C.E. Krebs; S. Geissler; K. Herrmann; et al. Exploring animal methods bias in biomedical research funding: Workshop proceedings and action steps, 2025. DOI: [10.1016/j.namjnl.2024.100004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.namjnl.2024.100004)
 102. [World's leading academic journals join pledge to fight bias in publishing.](#)
 103. [When Journals Play Favorites.](#)
 104. [Gender and affiliation bias in scientific publishing.](#)
 105. [Gender Bias in academic publishing.](#)
 106. [How systemic biases in academic publishing make us all poor.](#)
 107. [We must end linguistic discrimination in academic publishing.](#)

108. [‘Nepotistic’ journals fast-track hyperprolific authors.](#)
109. [Non-native English speaking scientists work much harder just to keep up, global research reveals.](#)
110. [Massive Study Reveals Editorial Bias and Nepotism in Biomedical Journals.](#)
111. [Advisory Note on Bias in Science Publishing.](#)
112. [Racially biased academic publishing in need of decolonisation.](#)
113. [Navigating Bias in Academic Publishing.](#)
114. [An influential academic safeguard is distorted by status bias.](#)
115. [Guest Post - Reckoning with Whiteness in Scholarly Publishing - UPDATED.](#)
116. [Animal Studies: Are Too Many Never Published At All?.](#)
117. [Gender and affiliation bias in scientific publishing.](#)
118. [Psychological research has a racism problem, Stanford scholar says.](#)
119. [PETA Scientist Tackles Bias Toward Experiments on Animals.](#)
120. [Do Academic Journals Favor Researchers from Their Own Institutions?.](#)
121. [Affiliation bias in peer review favours male authors - study.](#)
122. [Home Bias in Top Economics Journals .](#)
123. [Breaking the Silence on Linguistic and Gender Bias in Scholarly Publishing: What Can Librarians Do?.](#)
124. [Gender Bias in academic publishing.](#)
125. [Linguistic Bias in Academic Publishing.](#)
126. [The State of Gender Bias in Scientific Publishing.](#)
127. [The Great Imbalance: Gender Inequality in Academic Publishing.](#)
128. [Racism in Academic Publishing.](#)
129. [Dismantling Racism In Scholarly Publishing, Intentionally And Unapologetically.](#)
130. [Are editors or editors-in-chief biased towards authors’ reputation/image when making decision about final selection or rejection of submitted work?.](#)
131. [Most Publications Show Clear Bias When Reporting on Animals.](#)
132. [Academic publishers collaborating in fight against bias announce key action on diversity data collection.](#)
133. [Psychological Research: Racial Biases in the Peer-review and Publishing Enterprise.](#)
134. [Power, Profit, and Privilege: Problematizing Scholarly Publishing.](#)
135. [Racial disparities in science and publishing.](#)
136. [Geographical bias is a tiny piece of the publishing story.](#)
137. [Bias Awareness in Scholarly Publishing.](#)
138. [Double-anonymous review is an effective way of combating status bias in scholarly pub-](#)

lishing .

139. [Sunlight not shadows: Double-anonymised peer review is not the answer to status bias.](#)
140. [Animal bias workshop: Drawing attention to animal bias in scientific publishing.](#)
141. [How language bias persists in scientific publishing despite AI tools.](#)
142. [Bias pervades the scientific reporting of animal studies, research suggests.](#)
143. [Personal biases speed up research publication.](#)
144. [Another Case Against Science’s Objectivity Myth: Nepotism in Publishing.](#)
145. [Massive Study Reveals Editorial Bias and Nepotism in Biomedical Journals.](#)
146. [Family ties ‘help scientists to get ahead’ in some countries.](#)
147. [PubMed Central and F1000 Research - More Signs of Favoritism and Activism, and More Conflicts of Interest.](#)
148. [Understanding and Avoiding Financial Bias in Research Publication.](#)
149. [Joshua Pitt on Silenced Issues in Academic Publishing.](#)
150. [Implicit Bias in the Publication Process: Evidence and Opportunities.](#)
151. [Weekend reads: Nepotism in journals; the lessons of the ‘lab leak’ theory; four decades of research misconduct.](#)
152. [Working to address Animal Method Bias in Scientific Publishing.](#)
153. [Animal Methods Bias: What is it and what can we do about it?.](#)
154. [Promoting Impartial Reviews of Non-Animal Research Methodologies: Tackling Animal Methods Bias.](#)
155. [Reducing publication bias in animal research.](#)
156. [Peer-Reviewed Journals’ Preference for Animal Experiments: Why It’s Bad for Science and How to Address it.](#)
157. [Multilingualism and Language Bias in Research Assessment: Supporting Non-English Speaking Scientists.](#)
158. [Breaking barriers: challenging English-language dominance in scientific publishing.](#)
159. [Why we need to break down the language divide in scientific publishing.](#)
160. [Working Group: Multilingualism and language biases in research assessment.](#)
161. [Prestigious journals make it hard for scientists who don’t speak English to get published, study finds.](#)
162. [The Hidden Bias of Science’s Universal Language.](#)
163. [The language barrier in scientific communication.](#)
164. [Animal studies riddled with bias, report finds.](#)
165. [Tackling discrimination in academic publishing.](#)
166. [Gender inequality study shows women strongly under-represented on marketing aca-](#)

[demic journal boards.](#)

8 Publication Delays

1. R.J. Carroll. Review Times in Statistical Journals: Tilting at Windmills?, 2004. DOI: [10.1111/j.0006-341X.2001.00001.x](#)
2. D. Leslie. Are Delays in Academic Publishing Necessary?, 2005. DOI: [10.1257/0002828053828608](#)
3. C.B. Amat. Editorial and publication delay of papers submitted to 14 selected Food Research journals. Influence of online posting, 2007. DOI: [10.1007/s11192-007-1823-8](#)
4. M. Khosrowjerdi; N. Zeraatkar; N. Vara. Publication Delay in Iranian Scholarly Journals, 2011. DOI: [10.1016/j.serrev.2011.06.004](#)
5. L.B. VossHall. The Glacial Pace of Scientific Publishing: Why It Hurts Everyone and What We Can Do To Fix It, 2012. DOI: [10.1096/fj.12-0901ufm](#)
6. A.B.L. Tort; Z.H. Targino; O.B. Amaral. Rising Publication Delays Inflate Journal Impact Factors, 2012. DOI: [10.1371/journal.pone.0053374](#)
7. B.-C. Bjork; D. Solomon. The publishing delay in scholarly peer-reviewed journals, 2013. DOI: [10.1016/j.joi.2013.09.001](#)
8. W.B. Lievers. Manuscript Processing Times Are Negatively Correlated with Journal Impact Factors, 2013. DOI: [10.1353/ils.2013.0022](#)
9. M.T. Kalcioğlu; Y. Ileri; S. Karaca; et al. Research on the Submission, Acceptance and Publication Times of Articles Submitted to International Otorhinolaryngology Journals, 2015. DOI: [10.5455/aim.2015.23.379-384](#)
10. R.D. Vale. Accelerating scientific publication in biology, 2015. DOI: [10.1073/pnas.1511912112](#)
11. V.M. Nguyen; N.R. Haddaway; L.F.G. Gutowsky; et al. How Long Is Too Long in Contemporary Peer Review? Perspectives from Authors Publishing in Conservation Biology Journals, 2015. DOI: [10.1371/journal.pone.0132557](#)
12. R. Villar. Delayed decisions - how long is too long?, 2016. DOI: [10.1093/jhps/hnw029](#)
13. K. Powell. Does it take too long to publish research?, 2016. DOI: [10.1038/530148a](#)
14. J. Huisman; J. Smits. Duration and quality of the peer review process: the author's perspective, 2017. DOI: [10.1007/s11192-017-2310-5](#)
15. P. Sebo; J.P. Fournier; C. Ragot; et al. Factors associated with publication speed in general medical journals: a retrospective study of bibliometric data, 2019. DOI: [10.1007/s11192-019-0310-5](#)

- [10.1007/s11192-019-03061-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-019-03061-8)
16. L.R. Forti; L.A. Solino; J.K. Szabo. Trade-off between urgency and reduced editorial capacity affect publication speed in ecological and medical journals during 2020, 2021. DOI: [10.1057/s41599-021-00920-9](https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-021-00920-9)
 17. X. Guo; X. Li; Y. Yu. Publication delay adjusted impact factor: The effect of publication delay of articles on journal impact factor, 2021. DOI: [10.1016/j.joi.2020.101100](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2020.101100)
 18. A.P. Christie; T.B. White; P.A. Martin; et al. Reducing publication delay to improve the efficiency and impact of conservation science, 2021. DOI: [10.7717/peerj.12245](https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.12245)
 19. M.Z. Andersen; S. Fonnes; J. Rosenberg. Time from submission to publication varied widely for biomedical journals: a systematic review, 2021. DOI: [10.1080/03007995.2021.1905622](https://doi.org/10.1080/03007995.2021.1905622)
 20. Z. Taskin; A. Taskin; G. Dogan; E. Kulczycki. Factors affecting time to publication in information science, 2022. DOI: [10.1007/s11192-022-04296-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-022-04296-8)
 21. S. Majumdar. A nine-year (2012-2020) study of publication delay in an open access Library and Information Science journal, 2023. DOI: [10.22452/mjlis.vol28no1.3](https://doi.org/10.22452/mjlis.vol28no1.3)
 22. R.L. Zimmer; A.C.B. Mancuso; U. Matte; P. Ashton-Prolla. Analysis of the interval between submission and publication in genetics journals, 2023. DOI: [10.1371/journal.pone.0284866](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0284866)
 23. T. Toth; M. Demeter; G. Halo; et al. Time Matters: What Factors Affect Submission-To-Acceptance Time in the Journal of Communication?, 2024. DOI: [10.1080/08934215.2024.2424544](https://doi.org/10.1080/08934215.2024.2424544)
 24. [Acceptance to publication time.](#)
 25. [The length it takes from submission to publication.](#)
 26. [Redefining Academic Publishing: Discussing a new metric for time from first submission to acceptance.](#)
 27. [Why does publishing take so long? Is the system broken?.](#)
 28. [Publishing a research paper takes a long time.](#)
 29. [Peer Review Has Lost Its Human Face. So, What's Next?.](#)
 30. [Lengthy Peer Review Times: What should be Done?.](#)
 31. [The long slog of publishing in economics.](#)
 32. [Why is peer review taking so long?.](#)
 33. [Foul play in scientific publishing: The phenomenon of academic papers being held hostage.](#)
 34. [Are there any incentives for professors to delay publication of papers even when the](#)

data is ready (PhD students)?.

35. Guest Post - Publishing Fast or Slow: How Speed Varies for Similar Journals.
36. Should I withdraw my paper because the editor is delaying the report?.
37. Slow-to-publish advisor: papers unpublished since 2011.
38. Are publishing delays getting worse?.
39. Time Taken to Publish.
40. What could be reasons for a manuscript to be extremely delayed for months after the required actual months for reviewing process?.
41. Why do academic journals take so long for reviews and publications?.
42. Why do journals take too long to decide whether the research is appropriate or not?.
43. Does rushing the editorial and review process undermine the quality of academic publication?.
44. Do PhD advisor professors have any incentives to delay publication of papers even when the data is ready?.

9 Publish or Perish

1. S. Lofthouse. Thoughts on "Publish or Perish", 1974.
Source: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3445579>
2. W.J. Broad. The Publishing Game: Getting More for Less: Meet the Least Publishable Unit, one way of squeezing more papers out of a research project, 1981. DOI: [10.1126/science.7008199](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.7008199)
3. M.D.M. Angell. Publish or Perish: A Proposal, 1986.
DOI: [10.7326/0003-4819-104-2-261](https://doi.org/10.7326/0003-4819-104-2-261)
4. E.J. Huth. Irresponsible Authorship and Wasteful Publication, 1986.
DOI: [10.7326/0003-4819-104-2-257](https://doi.org/10.7326/0003-4819-104-2-257)
5. J. Laszlo. Publish and/or Perish: Discovery and/or Fraud, 1988.
DOI: [10.3109/07357908809077051](https://doi.org/10.3109/07357908809077051)
6. N.G. Desai. Why 'publish or perish'? Why not 'publish and prosper'? Perspectives from developing countries, 2005. DOI: [10.4103/0019-5545.46066](https://doi.org/10.4103/0019-5545.46066)
7. M.R. McGrail; C.M. Rickard; R. Jones. Publish or perish: a systematic review of interventions to increase academic publication rates, 2006. DOI: [10.1080/07294360500453053](https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360500453053)
8. T.L. Baldwin. Publish or perish: An evaluation of the quality, quantity, ethics and review process of IEEE/PES: Advanced technology for assisting the review process,

2008. DOI: [10.1109/PES.2008.4596777](https://doi.org/10.1109/PES.2008.4596777)
9. C. Baethge. Publish Together or Perish, 2008. DOI: [10.3238/arztebl.2008.0380](https://doi.org/10.3238/arztebl.2008.0380)
10. H.P. van Dalen; K. Henkens. Intended and unintended consequences of a publish-or-perish culture: A worldwide survey, 2012. DOI: [10.1002/asi.22636](https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.22636)
11. I. Lee. Publish or perish: The myth and reality of academic publishing, 2012. DOI: [10.1017/S0261444811000504](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000504)
12. D.B. Elliott. Salami slicing and the SPU: Publish or Perish?, 2013. DOI: [10.1111/opo.12090](https://doi.org/10.1111/opo.12090)
13. S. Rawat; S. Meena. Publish or perish: Where are we heading?, 2014. PMCID: [PMC3999612](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/PMC3999612/)
14. I. Lee. Publish or perish: The myth and reality of academic publishing, 2014. DOI: [10.1017/S0261444811000504](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444811000504)
15. M.S.M. Takrouiri. Publish or perish but do not publish and perish, 2016. DOI: [10.4103/0259-1162.181225](https://doi.org/10.4103/0259-1162.181225)
16. M.A. Kana. "Publish or perish" is good for African research, 2016. DOI: [10.1136/bmj.i121](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.i121)
17. M.P. Cariappa; S.S. Dalal; K. Chatterjee. To publish and perish: A Faustian bargain or a Hobson's choice. DOI: [10.1016/j.mjafi.2016.03.005](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mjafi.2016.03.005)
18. S. Al-Adawi; B.H. Ali; I. Al-Zakwani. Research Misconduct: The Peril of Publish or Perish, 2016. DOI: [10.5001/omj.2016.02](https://doi.org/10.5001/omj.2016.02)
19. N.C. Herndon (Editor). Research Fraud and the Publish or Perish World of Academia, 2016. DOI: [10.1080/1046669X.2016.1186469](https://doi.org/10.1080/1046669X.2016.1186469)
20. K. Weisshaar. Publish and Perish? An Assessment of Gender Gaps in Promotion to Tenure in Academia, 2017. DOI: [10.1093/sf/sox052](https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/sox052)
21. S.S. Hasan; K. Ahmadi. Publish or Perish: A Mandate With Negative Collateral Consequences, 2017. DOI: [10.1097/ACM.0000000000001517](https://doi.org/10.1097/ACM.0000000000001517)
22. M.A. Deshmukh; A.S. Dodamani; M.R. Khairnar; R.G. Naik. Research Misconduct: A Neglected Plague, 2017. DOI: [10.4103/0019-557X.200255](https://doi.org/10.4103/0019-557X.200255)
23. J. Han; Z. Li. How Metrics-Based Academic Evaluation Could Systematically Induce Academic Misconduct: A Case Study, 2017. DOI: [10.1215/18752160-4275144](https://doi.org/10.1215/18752160-4275144)
24. W. Quan; B. Chen; F. Shu. Publish or impoverish: An investigation of the monetary reward system of science in China (1999-2016), 2017. DOI: [10.1108/AJIM-01-2017-0014](https://doi.org/10.1108/AJIM-01-2017-0014)
25. I.A. Moosa. Publish or perish: Origin and perceived benefits: Perceived Benefits versus Unintended Consequences, 2018. DOI: [10.4337/9781786434937.00007](https://doi.org/10.4337/9781786434937.00007)
26. D.R. Grimes; C.T. Bauch; J.P.A. Ioannidis. Modelling science trustworthiness under

- publish or perish pressure, 2018. DOI: [10.1098/rsos.171511](https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.171511)
27. S. Mallapaty. China bans cash rewards for publishing papers, 2020. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-020-00574-8](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-020-00574-8)
 28. M. Lambovska; D. Todorova. 'Publish and Flourish' instead of 'Publish or Perish': A Motivation Model for Top-quality Publications, 2021. DOI: [10.17323/jle.2021.11522](https://doi.org/10.17323/jle.2021.11522)
 29. B. Eshchanov; K. Abduraimov; M. Ibragimova; R. Eshchanov. Efficiency of "Publish or Perish" Policy - Some Considerations Based on the Uzbekistan Experience, 2021. DOI: [10.3390/publications9030033](https://doi.org/10.3390/publications9030033)
 30. M.U. Werner. Salami-slicing and duplicate publication: gatekeepers challenges, 2021. DOI: [10.1515/sjpain-2020-0181](https://doi.org/10.1515/sjpain-2020-0181)
 31. S.R. Singh. Commentary: Publish or perish - Musings of a young faculty, 2021. DOI: [10.4103/ijo.IJO_2511_21](https://doi.org/10.4103/ijo.IJO_2511_21)
 32. N. Madikizela-Madiya. Transforming higher education spaces through ethical research publication: a critique of the publish or perish aphorism, 2022. DOI: [10.1080/07294360.2022.2048634](https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2022.2048634)
 33. T. Amutuhaire. The Reality of the 'Publish or Perish' Concept, Perspectives from the Global South, 2022. DOI: [10.1007/s12109-022-09879-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12109-022-09879-0)
 34. N. Ambrosino; F. Pacini. Publish or perish? Perish to publish? (Unrequested advices to young researchers), 2022. DOI: [10.1016/j.pulmoe.2022.03.008](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pulmoe.2022.03.008)
 35. V. Grech. Publish or perish, information overload, and journal impact factors - A conflicting tripod of forces, 2022. DOI: [10.4103/sja.sja_632_21](https://doi.org/10.4103/sja.sja_632_21)
 36. S. Elbanna; J. Child. From 'publish or perish' to 'publish for purpose', 2023. DOI: [10.1111/emre.12618](https://doi.org/10.1111/emre.12618)
 37. S. Saxena; T. Godfrey; J. Yannessa. Publish or perish: time for a rethink?, 2023. DOI: [10.32388/FPZJKP](https://doi.org/10.32388/FPZJKP)
 38. B.H. Mutongoza. Pressured to perform: The negative consequences of the 'publish or perish' phenomenon among junior academics, 2023. DOI: [10.36615/sotls.v7i2.301](https://doi.org/10.36615/sotls.v7i2.301)
 39. J.S. Xie; M.J. Ali. To Slice or Perish, 2023. DOI: [10.1080/08820538.2023.2172813](https://doi.org/10.1080/08820538.2023.2172813)
 40. M. Kozlov. 'Publish or Perish' is now a card game - not just an academic's life, 2024. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-024-02511-5](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-024-02511-5)
 41. S.R. Brown; J. Lund. POP culture: the increasing perils of publish or perish. A farewell from the Editors in Chief, 2024. DOI: [10.1007/s10151-023-02900-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10151-023-02900-4)
 42. J.S. Trueblood; D.B. Allison; S.M. Field; A.R. Teodorescu. The misalignment of incentives in academic publishing and implications for journal reform, 2024. DOI: [10.1073/pnas.2401231121](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2401231121)

43. F. Hourneaux; K.M. Hamza; R.A. Cordeiro. The "publish and perish" phenomenon: how journals can be affected by it and survive, 2024. DOI: [10.1108/RAUSP-07-2024-280](https://doi.org/10.1108/RAUSP-07-2024-280)
44. A. Cakir; D. Kuyurtar; A. Balyer. The effects of the publish or perish culture on publications in the field of educational administration in Türkiye, 2024. DOI: [10.1016/j.ssaho.2024.100817](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2024.100817)
45. D.Y. Shu; V. Meadows; R.M. Alvidrez; M. Bai. The publish or perish game: an interview with the inventor, 2024. DOI: [10.1002/1873-3468.15039](https://doi.org/10.1002/1873-3468.15039)
46. J. Vasconez-Gonzalez; J.S. Izquierdo-Condoy; P. Naranjo-Lara; M.A. Garcia-Bereguian; E. Ortiz-Prado. Integrity at stake: confronting "publish or perish" in the developing world and emerging economies, 2024. DOI: [10.3389/fmed.2024.1405424](https://doi.org/10.3389/fmed.2024.1405424)
47. I.A. Moosa. *Publish or Perish: Perceived Benefits versus Unintended Consequences*. 2024. ISBN: [9781035307791](https://doi.org/9781035307791)
48. D.E. Wright. Five problems plaguing publishing in the life sciences-and one common cause, 2024. DOI: [10.1002/1873-3468.15018](https://doi.org/10.1002/1873-3468.15018)
49. M. Knochelmann. Formal authorship in the wake of uncertain futures: the narrative of publish or perish in the humanities, 2024. DOI: [10.1093/reseval/rvae044](https://doi.org/10.1093/reseval/rvae044)
50. R. Ciriminna; G. Angellotti; G.L. Petri; M. Pagliaro. Reproducibility in chemistry research, 2024. DOI: [10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e33658](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e33658)
51. G. Abramo; C.A. D'Angelo. Hyperprolific authorship: Unveiling the extent of extreme publishing in the 'publish or perish' era, 2025. DOI: [10.1016/j.joi.2025.101658](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2025.101658)
52. G. Abramo; C.A. D'Angelo. Hyperprolific authorship: Unveiling the extent of extreme publishing in the 'publish or perish' era, 2025. DOI: [10.1016/j.joi.2025.101658](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2025.101658)
53. J.K. Aronson. When I use a word ... "Publish or perish": adverse effects, 2025. DOI: [10.1136/bmj.r1577](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.r1577)
54. [Publish or perish.](#)
55. [The 'publish or perish' mentality is fuelling research paper retractions - and undermining science.](#)
56. [Publish or Perish: A Humorous Party Game about Academia.](#)
57. [A Game Where We Embrace Plagiarism and The Reviewer 2 In Us.](#)
58. [Why won't academia let go of 'publish or perish'?](#)
59. [Why "Publish or Perish" is bad advice.](#)
60. [Publish-or-perish: Peer review and the corruption of science.](#)
61. [Challenging 'publish or perish' culture-researchers call for overhaul of academic publishing.](#)

62. IU researchers co-author study challenging ‘publish or perish’ culture, call for overhaul of academic publishing.
63. ‘Publish or perish’: no longer the mantra of academics?.
64. African academics may perish even when they have published.
65. Publish or Perish: Navigating the Academic Landscape.
66. Publish or Perish Paradox.
67. Articles on Publish or perish.
68. Publish or Perish? Or Publish with Purpose?.
69. The Dangers of Medical Academia’s ‘Publish or Perish’ Culture and How It Can Affect Clinical Practice.
70. Modern Science Has a Publish-or-Perish Problem.
71. "Publish-or-perish" and ChatGPT: a dangerous mix.
72. Exaggerated Claims - Has "Publish or Perish" Become "Publicize or Perish"?
73. Why publish or perish is no longer sustainable.
74. Publish or perish: the crisis of research today.
75. Beyond Burnout: AI as an Academic Ally in the "Publish or Perish" Culture.
76. The ‘publish or perish’ mentality is undermining science.
77. Publish or Perish: What Are Its Consequences?.
78. Is It Time for "Publish or Perish" to Perish?.
79. Publish-or-Perish Must Perish: A guide to reducing the academy’s plague of marginal scholarship.
80. Publish or Perish - Another Example of Goodhart’s Law.
81. The "Publish or Perish" rewarding system may unwittingly lead to pseudoscience.
82. Publish or perish? Faculty publishing decisions and the RPT process.
83. Perish not publish? New study quantifies the lack of female authors in scientific journals.
84. Is "Publish or Perish" Still Relevant?.
85. Our ‘publish-or-perish’ culture is breaking the academy.
86. Exploring the ‘Publish or Perish’ Mentality and its Impact on Research Paper Retractions.
87. What’s your number? Publish or perish leads to worsening mental health outcomes in PhD students.
88. Publish and perish at Imperial College London: the death of Stefan Grimm.
89. How bad is publish-or-perish for the quality of science?.
90. How Publish or Perish Promotes Inaccuracy in Science - and Journalism.
91. The perils of publish or perish.

92. [How academic publishers profit from the publish-or-perish culture.](#)
93. [Publish-or-Perish Culture Promotes Scientific Narcissism.](#)
94. [Does authorship mean anything when academic papers are simply citable tokens?.](#)
95. [The Cheating Epidemic: Publish or Perish Culture Ruins Scientific Integrity.](#)
96. [The problem with the pressure to publish.](#)
97. [Does anybody feel like academic publication pressure is becoming unsustainable?.](#)
98. [Tracing the origins of ‘publish or perish’.](#)

10 Predatory and Questionable Publishers

1. J. Beall. "Predatory" Open-Access Scholarly Publishers, 2010.
[Source: https://core.ac.uk/reader/11886760](https://core.ac.uk/reader/11886760)
2. J. Beall. Predatory publishers are corrupting open access, 2012. [DOI: 10.1038/489179a](#)
3. J. Beall. Medical Publishing Triage - Chronicling Predatory Open Access Publishers, 2013. [DOI: 10.1016/S2049-0801\(13\)70035-9](#)
4. J. Beall. Predatory publishing is just one of the consequences of gold open access, 2013.
[DOI: 10.1087/20130203](#)
5. J. Bohannon. Who's Afraid of Peer Review?, 2013. [DOI: 10.1126/science.342.6154.60](#)
6. D. Butler. Sham journals scam authors, 2013. [DOI: 10.1038/495421a](#)
7. J. Kaiser. U.S. Government Accuses Open Access Publisher of Trademark Infringement, 2013. [DOI: 10.1126/article.24204](#)
8. J. Beall. Five Predatory Mega-Journals: A Review, 2013. [DOI: 10.5260/chara.14.4.20](#)
9. J.D. Bowman. Predatory Publishing, Questionable Peer Review, and Fraudulent Conferences, 2014. [DOI: 10.5688/ajpe7810176](#)
10. J. Xia; J.L. Harmon; K.G. Connolly. Who publishes in "predatory" journals?, 2014.
[DOI: 10.1002/asi.23265](#)
11. M. Jalalian; H. Mahboobi. Hijacked Journals and Predatory Publishers: Is There a Need to Re-Think How to Assess the Quality of Academic Research?, 2014. [DOI: 10.14456/WJST.2014.16](#)
12. M. Berger; J. Cirasella. Beyond Beall's List: Better understanding predatory publishers, 2015. [DOI: 10.5860/crln.76.3.9277](#)
13. C. Shen; B.-C. Björk. 'Predatory' open access: a longitudinal study of article volumes and market characteristics, 2015. [DOI: 10.1186/s12916-015-0469-2](#)
14. F. Nahai. The Rise of Predatory Journals: What Difference Does It Make?, 2015. [DOI:](#)

- [10.1093/asj/sjv085](https://doi.org/10.1093/asj/sjv085)
15. J. Clark; R. Smith. Firm action needed on predatory journals, 2015.
DOI: [10.1136/bmj.h210](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.h210)
 16. M. Kozak; O. Iefremova; J. Hartley. Spamming in scholarly publishing: A case study, 2015. DOI: [10.1002/asi.23521](https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.23521)
 17. J. Beall. Predatory journals: Ban predators from the scientific record, 2016. DOI: [10.1038/534326a](https://doi.org/10.1038/534326a)
 18. J. Beall. Best practices for scholarly authors in the age of predatory journals, 2016. DOI: [10.1308/rcsann.2016.0056](https://doi.org/10.1308/rcsann.2016.0056)
 19. M. Dadkhah; G. Bianciardi. Ranking Predatory Journals: Solve the Problem Instead of Removing It!, 2016. PMID: [27123411](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27123411/)
 20. R.R. Reynolds. The predatory publishing phenomenon: dead end or just an inconvenience on the road to a new scholarly publishing landscape?, 2016.
DOI: [10.1629/uksg.325](https://doi.org/10.1629/uksg.325)
 21. J. Beall. Essential Information about Predatory Publishers and Journals, 2016. DOI: [10.6017/ihe.2016.86.9358](https://doi.org/10.6017/ihe.2016.86.9358)
 22. R.W. Byard. The forensic implications of predatory publishing, 2016.
DOI: [10.1007/s12024-016-9771-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12024-016-9771-3)
 23. S. Natarajan; A.G. Nair. "FakeBooks" - predatory journals: The dark side of publishing, 2016. DOI: [10.4103/0301-4738.179733](https://doi.org/10.4103/0301-4738.179733)
 24. K.E. Noga-Styron; J.M. Olivero; S. Britto. Predatory Journals in the Criminal Justices Sciences: Getting our Cite on the Target, 2016. DOI: [10.1080/10511253.2016.1195421](https://doi.org/10.1080/10511253.2016.1195421)
 25. G.S. Seethapathy; J.U.S. Kumar; A.S. Hareesha. India's Scientific Publication in Predatory Journals: Need for Regulating Quality of Indian Science and Education, 2016. DOI: [10.18520/cs/v111/i11/1759-1764](https://doi.org/10.18520/cs/v111/i11/1759-1764)
 26. M. Dadkhah; T. Maliszewski; M.D. Jazi. Characteristics of Hijacked Journals and Predatory Publishers: Our Observations in the Academic World, 2016.
DOI: [10.1016/j.tips.2016.04.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tips.2016.04.002)
 27. M. Dadkhah; T. Maliszewski; J.A.T. da Silva. Hijacked journals, hijacked web-sites, journal phishing, misleading metrics, and predatory publishing: actual and potential threats to academic integrity and publishing ethics, 2016.
DOI: [10.1007/s12024-016-9785-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12024-016-9785-x)
 28. D. Moher; L. Shamseer; K.D. Cobey; et al. Stop this waste of people, animals and money, 2017. DOI: [10.1038/549023a](https://doi.org/10.1038/549023a)
 29. S. Eriksson; G. Helgesson. Time to stop talking about 'predatory journals', 2017. DOI: [10.1038/549023a](https://doi.org/10.1038/549023a)

[10.1002/leap.1135](https://doi.org/10.1002/leap.1135)

30. L. Shamseer; D. Moher; O. Maduekwe; et al. Potential predatory and legitimate biomedical journals: can you tell the difference? A cross-sectional comparison, 2017. DOI: [10.1186/s12916-017-0785-9](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12916-017-0785-9)
31. S. Beshyah. Fake academia and bogus conferences are on the rise in the middle east: Time to act, 2017. DOI: [10.4103/ijmbs.ijmbs_61_17](https://doi.org/10.4103/ijmbs.ijmbs_61_17)
32. O. Laccourreye; F. Rubin; H. Maisonneuve. "Predatory" journals threatening the scientific medical press, 2017. DOI: [10.1016/j.anorl.2017.08.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anorl.2017.08.003)
33. C. Arthur. Predatory Publishing: How Not To Fall Prey, 2017. DOI: [10.21061/valib.v6i1.1327](https://doi.org/10.21061/valib.v6i1.1327)
34. P. Sorokowski; E. Kulczycki; A. Sorokowska; K. Pisanski. Predatory journals recruit fake editor, 2017. DOI: [10.1038/543481a](https://doi.org/10.1038/543481a)
35. A. Manca; L. Cugusi; Z. Dvir; F. Deriu. PubMed should raise the bar for journal inclusion, 2017. DOI: [10.1016/S0140-6736\(17\)31943-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(17)31943-8)
36. L.E. Ferris; M.A. Winker. Ethical issues in publishing in predatory journals, 2017. DOI: [10.11613/BM.2017.030](https://doi.org/10.11613/BM.2017.030)
37. S.E. Van Nuland; K.A. Rogers. Academic nightmares: Predatory publishing, 2017. DOI: [10.1002/ase.1671](https://doi.org/10.1002/ase.1671)
38. L. Tin; B. Ivana; B. Biljana; et al. Predatory and fake scientific journals/publishers: A global outbreak with rising trend: A review, 2017. DOI: [10.5937/GeoPan1403069L](https://doi.org/10.5937/GeoPan1403069L)
39. P. Darbyshire. Fake news. Fake journals. Fake conferences. What we can do, 2017. DOI: [10.1111/jocn.14214](https://doi.org/10.1111/jocn.14214)
40. R. Chandra; E.W. Fisher; T.M. Jones. Open Access: Is There a Predator at the Door?, 2018. DOI: [10.1055/s-0037-1609057](https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0037-1609057)
41. B. Patwardhan; S. Nagarkar; S.R. Gadre; et al. A critical analysis of the 'UGC-approved list of journals', 2018. DOI: [10.18520/cs/v114/i06/1299-1303](https://doi.org/10.18520/cs/v114/i06/1299-1303)
42. G. Richtig; M. Berger; B. Lange-Asschenfeldt; W. Aberer; E. Richtig. Problems and challenges of predatory journals, 2018. DOI: [10.1111/jdv.15039](https://doi.org/10.1111/jdv.15039)
43. D.A. Forero; M.H. Oermann; A. Manca; et al. Negative Effects of "Predatory" Journals on Global Health Research, 2018. DOI: [10.29024/aogh.2389](https://doi.org/10.29024/aogh.2389)
44. D.S. Chawla. The undercover academic keeping tabs on 'predatory' publishing, 2018. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-018-02921-2](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-018-02921-2)
45. O. Laccourreye; F. Rubin; H. Maisonneuve. "Predatory" journals threatening the scientific medical press, 2018. DOI: [10.1016/j.anorl.2017.08.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anorl.2017.08.003)
46. A.R. Memon. Predatory Journals Spamming for Publications: What Should Researchers

- Do?, 2018. DOI: [10.1007/s11948-017-9955-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-017-9955-6)
47. M.G. Umlauf; Y. Mochizuki. Predatory publishing and cybercrime targeting academics, 2018. DOI: [10.1111/ijn.12656](https://doi.org/10.1111/ijn.12656)
 48. R. Watson. Predatory journals and the pollution of academic publishing, 2018. DOI: [10.1111/jonm.12739](https://doi.org/10.1111/jonm.12739)
 49. S. Kisely. Predatory journals and dubious publishers: how to avoid being their prey, 2019. DOI: [10.1192/bja.2018.56](https://doi.org/10.1192/bja.2018.56)
 50. A. Grudniewicz; D. Moher; K.D. Cobey; et al. Predatory journals: no definition, no defence, 2019. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-019-03759-y](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-019-03759-y)
 51. M. Bagues; M. Sylos-Labini; N. Zinovyeva. A walk on the wild side: ‘Predatory’ journals and information asymmetries in scientific evaluations, 2019. DOI: [10.1016/j.respol.2018.04.013](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2018.04.013)
 52. M. Strinzel; A. Severin; K. Milzow; M. Egger. Blacklists and Whitelists To Tackle Predatory Publishing: a Cross-Sectional Comparison and Thematic Analysis, 2019. DOI: [10.1128/mbio.00411-19](https://doi.org/10.1128/mbio.00411-19)
 53. P.E. Cress; D.B. Sarwer. Predatory Journals: An Ethical Crisis in Publishing, 2019. DOI: [10.1093/asjof/ojz001](https://doi.org/10.1093/asjof/ojz001)
 54. A. Cortegiani; G. Misseri; C. Gregoretti; S. Einav; A. Giaratano. The challenge of the predatory open-access publishing outbreak, 2019. DOI: [10.1097/EJA.0000000000001083](https://doi.org/10.1097/EJA.0000000000001083)
 55. M.D. Krasowski; J.C. Lawrence; A.S. Briggs; B.A. Ford. Burden and Characteristics of Unsolicited Emails from Medical/Scientific Journals, Conferences, and Webinars to Faculty and Trainees at an Academic Pathology Department, 2019. DOI: [10.4103/jpi.jpi_12_19](https://doi.org/10.4103/jpi.jpi_12_19)
 56. M.F. Abad-Garcia. Plagiarism and predatory journals: A threat to scientific integrity, 2019. DOI: [10.1016/j.anpede.2018.11.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anpede.2018.11.006)
 57. K.D. Cobey; A. Grudniewicz; M.M. Lalu; et al. Knowledge and motivations of researchers publishing in presumed predatory journals: a survey, 2019. DOI: [10.1136/bmjopen-2018-026516](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2018-026516)
 58. J.A.T. da Silva; J. Dobranszki; P. Tsigaris; A. Al-Khatib. Predatory and exploitative behaviour in academic publishing: An assessment, 2019. DOI: [10.1016/j.acalib.2019.102071](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2019.102071)
 59. S. Manley. Predatory Journals on Trial: Allegations, Responses, and Lessons for Scholarly Publishing from FTC v. OMICS, 2019. DOI: [10.3138/jsp.50.3.02](https://doi.org/10.3138/jsp.50.3.02)
 60. A.J. Cohen; G. Patino; P. Kamal; et al. Perspectives From Authors and Editors in the Biomedical Disciplines on Predatory Journals: Survey Study, 2019. DOI: [10.2196/13769](https://doi.org/10.2196/13769)
 61. D. Mills; K. Inouye. Problematizing ‘predatory publishing’: A systematic review of

- factors shaping publishing motives, decisions, and experiences, 2020.
DOI: [10.1002/leap.1325](https://doi.org/10.1002/leap.1325)
62. S.A. Elmore; E.H. Weston. Predatory Journals: What They Are and How to Avoid Them, 2020. DOI: [10.1177/0192623320920209](https://doi.org/10.1177/0192623320920209)
 63. D. Vervoort; X. Ma; M.G. Shrimel. Money down the drain: predatory publishing in the COVID-19 era, 2020. DOI: [10.17269/s41997-020-00411-5](https://doi.org/10.17269/s41997-020-00411-5)
 64. R. Van Noorden. Hundreds of scientists have peer-reviewed for predatory journals, 2020. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-020-00709-x](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-020-00709-x)
 65. S. Ibrahim; A. Saw. The Perils of Predatory Journals and Conferences, 2020. DOI: [10.5704/MOJ.2007.003](https://doi.org/10.5704/MOJ.2007.003)
 66. Y.M.-A. Zakout. Predatory Publishers/Journals in Medical Sciences: How to Avoid, Stop, and What to Do after Being Scammed by Them?, 2020. DOI: [10.1007/s12029-020-00418-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12029-020-00418-8)
 67. J.A.T. da Silva. Is there a need for creators of imaginary authors to face legal consequences?, 2020. DOI: [10.3325/cmj.2020.61.561](https://doi.org/10.3325/cmj.2020.61.561)
 68. L. Dobusch; M. Heimstädt; K. Mayer; T. Ross-Hellauer. Defining predatory journals: no peer review, no point, 2020. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-020-00911-x](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-020-00911-x)
 69. J.A.T. da Silva. An Alert to COVID-19 Literature in Predatory Publishing Venues, 2020. DOI: [10.1016/j.acalib.2020.102187](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2020.102187)
 70. B.A. Sabel; R. Seifert. How criminal science publishing gangs damage the genesis of knowledge and technology – a call to action to restore trust, 2021. DOI: [10.1007/s00210-021-02158-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00210-021-02158-3)
 71. P. Newton; K. Sreenivasan. Commentary: The publication pandemic, 2021. DOI: [10.1063/PT.6.3.20210526a](https://doi.org/10.1063/PT.6.3.20210526a)
 72. O. Brandts-Longtin; M. Lalu; E.A. Adie; et al. Assessing the impact of predatory journals on policy and guidance documents: a cross-sectional study protocol, 2021. DOI: [10.1136/bmjopen-2021-059445](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2021-059445)
 73. R.M. Allen. When Peril Responds to Plague: Predatory Journal Engagement with COVID-19, 2021. DOI: [10.1108/LHT-01-2021-0011](https://doi.org/10.1108/LHT-01-2021-0011)
 74. G.A. Taylor. Predatory journals: a different pandemic, 2021. DOI: [10.1007/s00247-020-04918-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00247-020-04918-4)
 75. M. Downes. Membership of the editorial boards of journals published by the predatory publisher OMICS: willing and unwilling participation, 2021. DOI: [10.47989/irpaper912](https://doi.org/10.47989/irpaper912)
 76. F. Krawczyk; E. Kulczycki. How is open access accused of being predatory? The impact of Beall's lists of predatory journals on academic publishing, 2021.

[DOI: 10.1016/j.acalib.2020.102271](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2020.102271)

77. N.S.L. Yeo-Teh; B.L. Tang. Wilfully submitting to and publishing in predatory journals - a covert form of research misconduct?, 2021. [DOI: 10.11613/BM.2021.030201](https://doi.org/10.11613/BM.2021.030201)
78. D. Mills; A. Branford; K. Inouye; et al. "Fake" Journals and the Fragility of Authenticity: Citation Indexes, "Predatory" Publishing, and the African Research Ecosystem, 2021. [DOI: 10.1080/13696815.2020.1864304](https://doi.org/10.1080/13696815.2020.1864304)
79. T. You; J. Park; J.Y. Lee; J. Yun; W.-S. Jung. Disturbance of questionable publishing to academia, 2022. [DOI: 10.1016/j.joi.2022.101294](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2022.101294)
80. T.A. Wilkinson; C.J. Russell; W.E. Bennett; E.R. Cheng; A.E. Carroll. A cross-sectional study of predatory publishing emails received by career development grant awardees, 2022. [DOI: 10.1136/bmjopen-2018-027928](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2018-027928)
81. V. Machacek; M. Srholec. Predatory publishing in Scopus: Evidence on cross-country differences, 2022. [DOI: 10.1162/qss_a_00213](https://doi.org/10.1162/qss_a_00213)
82. C.G. Torres. Editorial misconduct: the case of online predatory journals, 2022. [DOI: 10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e08999](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2022.e08999)
83. T. Elliott; B. Fazeen; A. Asrat; et al. Perceptions on the prevalence and impact of predatory academic journals and conferences: A global survey of researchers, 2022. [DOI: 10.1002/leap.1458](https://doi.org/10.1002/leap.1458)
84. M. Dora; R.K. Kampa. Predatory Publishing in Indian LIS Research: A Case Study, 2023. [DOI: 10.1080/00987913.2023.2174405](https://doi.org/10.1080/00987913.2023.2174405)
85. C. Shen; L. Shah. Predatory publishing practices: what researchers should know before submitting their manuscript, 2023. [DOI: 10.1629/uksg.631](https://doi.org/10.1629/uksg.631)
86. D. Stephen. Medical articles in questionable journals are less impactful than those in non-questionable journals but still extensively cited, 2023. [DOI: 10.1007/s11192-023-04763-w](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-023-04763-w)
87. D. Nicholas; B. Rodriguez-Bravo; C. Boukacem-Zeghmouri; et al. Early career researchers and predatory journals during the Covid-19 pandemic. An international analysis, 2023. [DOI: 10.3145/epi.2023.ene.17](https://doi.org/10.3145/epi.2023.ene.17)
88. S. Leducq; N. Bonsu; K. Clement; R. Barlow; H.C. Williams. Predator and Alien: the threat of predatory journals and conferences, 2023. [DOI: 10.1093/ced/llad133](https://doi.org/10.1093/ced/llad133)
89. G. Tang; J. Peng. Are the lists of questionable journals reasonable: A case study of early warning journal lists, 2023. [DOI: 10.1080/08989621.2023.2261846](https://doi.org/10.1080/08989621.2023.2261846)
90. M.R. Freiermuth. Now you have to pay! A deeper look at publishing practices of predatory journals, 2023. [DOI: 10.1002/leap.1583](https://doi.org/10.1002/leap.1583)
91. P. Braak; D. van Gorp; C. Hukkelhoven; T. de Roo. Predatory and Questionable

Publishing Practices: How to Recognise and Avoid Them, 2024.

DOI: [10.5281/zenodo.10688080](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10688080)

92. A. Chandra; S. Dasgupta. Predatory Journals: What the Researchers and Authors Should Know, 2024. DOI: [10.1016/j.amjmed.2024.02.015](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amjmed.2024.02.015)
93. N. Wilson. Predatory Journals, 2024. DOI: [10.1093/biosci/biad104](https://doi.org/10.1093/biosci/biad104)
94. O.W. Tomlinson. Predatory publishing in medical education: a rapid scoping review, 2024. DOI: [10.1186/s12909-024-05024-x](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-024-05024-x)
95. A. Martinino; G. Campagnoli; S. Dallavalle; et al. Investigating Country-Specific Perceptions of Predatory Journals and Their Impact on Scholarly Integrity: A Systematic Review, 2024. DOI: [10.7759/cureus.64674](https://doi.org/10.7759/cureus.64674)
96. C. Fadel; A. Milanova; J. Suran; et al. A narrative review of the phenomenon of predatory journals to create awareness among researchers in veterinary medicine, 2024. DOI: [10.1111/jvp.13448](https://doi.org/10.1111/jvp.13448)
97. E. Castellana. The ugly phenomenon of predatory journals: what they are and how to avoid them, 2024. DOI: [10.1136/ejhpharm-2024-004354](https://doi.org/10.1136/ejhpharm-2024-004354)
98. M.K. Merga. Understanding ‘Predatory’ Journals and Implications for Guiding Student and Client Information Seeking, 2024. DOI: [10.1080/01930826.2024.2371275](https://doi.org/10.1080/01930826.2024.2371275)
99. O.F. Khabour; K.H. Alzoubi; W.M. Aldarabseh. Awareness of Jordanian Researchers About Predatory Journals: A Need for Training, 2024. DOI: [10.1007/s11948-024-00519-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-024-00519-8)
100. T. Treasure. Open access publishing: the proliferation of journals of questionable quality, 2024. DOI: [10.1093/ejcts/ezae320](https://doi.org/10.1093/ejcts/ezae320)
101. C. Laine; D. Babskib; V.C. Bachelet; et al. Predatory Journals - What Can We Do to Protect Their Prey?, 2025. DOI: [10.1056/NEJMe2415937](https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMe2415937)
102. J.B. Soriano; A. Ruano-Ravina. The rising threat of predatory journals and paper mills in respiratory medicine and research, 2025. DOI: [10.1016/S2213-2600\(25\)00117-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2213-2600(25)00117-1)
103. M.A. Albert; M.M. Lalu; A. Grudniewicz. Investigating the trustworthiness of research evidence used to inform public health policy: a qualitative interview study on the use of predatory journal citations in policy documents, 2025. DOI: [10.1186/s12961-024-01282-9](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12961-024-01282-9)
104. Z. Faulkes (Editor). Stinging the Predators: A collection of papers that should never have been published, 2025. DOI: [10.6084/m9.figshare.5248264](https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.5248264)
105. H. Maisonneuve. Predatory journals and paper mills jeopardise knowledge management, 2025. DOI: [10.1016/j.bulcan.2024.12.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bulcan.2024.12.002)
106. I.S. Kaya; et al. Z. Taskin G. Dogan. Not All ‘Predators’ Are the Same: Exploring the

- Spectrum of Questionable Journals, 2025. DOI: [10.31235/osf.io/gjfyw_v1](https://doi.org/10.31235/osf.io/gjfyw_v1)
107. A. Larson; M. Shelomi. Stinging predatory journals: a brief overview and recommendations, 2025. DOI: [10.3897/ese.2025.e137960](https://doi.org/10.3897/ese.2025.e137960)
 108. H.A. Haleem; M.M. Kadhum. Combating unethical publications in Iraqi higher education: A pre- and post-intervention programme assessment, 2025.
DOI: [10.22452/mjlis.vol30no1.5](https://doi.org/10.22452/mjlis.vol30no1.5)
 109. ‘Galling’: Journal scammed by guest editor impersonator.
 110. India’s Fight Against Predatory Journals: An Interview with Professor Bhushan Patwardhan.
 111. Predatory and Questionable Publishing Practices.
 112. Beall’s List of Potential Predatory Journals and Publishers.
 113. Predatory Publishers: Questionable Journals.
 114. Predatory or bogus journals, publishers and conferences.
 115. Predatory publishing.
 116. Publishing your Research.
 117. Predatory or questionable publishers and journals: Control strategies.
 118. Questionable and Unethical Publishers: How to spot them and enable researchers to avoid being trapped.
 119. Predatory Publishers and Journals.
 120. Trouble at paper mill.
 121. Wiley’s ‘fake science’ scandal is just the latest chapter in a broader crisis of trust universities must address.
 122. Hindawi (publisher).
 123. Avoiding Predatory Journals and Questionable Conferences: A Resource Guide.
 124. The Hindawi Files. Part 3: Wiley.
 125. Why we should not publish in MDPI special issues?.
 126. Reading the Leaves of Publishing Speed: The Cases of Hindawi, Frontiers, and PLOS.
 127. From Open Access Pioneer to Retraction Scandal: The Fall of Hindawi.
 128. ‘Fraudulent’ peer review strikes another academic publisher .
 129. Victim of the Hindawi Scandal?.
 130. Combatting Predatory Academic Journals and Conferences.
 131. The threat of predatory journals in the midst of a pandemic.
 132. Understanding and Combating Predatory Journals.
 133. Protect Yourself and Your Research from Predatory Journal Publishers.

134. [Science's spam epidemic.](#)
135. [Predatory Journals in the Age of COVID-19.](#)
136. [Predatory Journals: A one stop shop for resources.](#)
137. [Predatory Publishing: Resources.](#)
138. [Warning over coronavirus and predatory journals.](#)
139. [Predatory Editing: A New Face of Predatory Publishing.](#)
140. [Considering presenting a paper at a scholarly conference? Choose carefully.](#)
141. [On the Mark? Responses to a Sting.](#)
142. [The Dark World of 'Citation Cartels': Predatory journals and bad-faith scholars are gaming the system - at scale.](#)
143. [Wiley shuts 19 scholarly journals amid AI paper mill problems.](#)
144. [Hindawi shuttering four journals overrun by paper mills.](#)
145. [The Hindawi Files. Part 1: The Timeline.](#)
146. [The Hindawi Files. Part 2: Hindawi.](#)
147. [The Hindawi Files. Part 3: Wiley.](#)
148. [Publisher shuts 19 journals amid AI paper mill problems.](#)
149. [News Feature: Predatory Journals and Paper Mills.](#)
150. [Open Access Publisher Accepts Nonsense Manuscript for Dollars.](#)
151. [All these papers were deliberately bad.](#)
152. [Without stronger ethical standards, predatory publishing will continue to be a permanent feature of scholarly communication.](#)
153. [Abusing Open Access: Predatory Publishing.](#)
154. [Why is predatory publishing a problem?.](#)
155. [Predatory publishing practices: what researchers should know before submitting their manuscript.](#)
156. [Journal Editors Sound Alarm on Predatory Medical Journals.](#)
157. [Fake journals aren't publishers at all - they are dishonest reformatters.](#)
158. [Democratising publishing or dodgy spammers? What 'inclusive' publishers tell us about the state of academic book publishing.](#)
159. [Fake academic journals are publishing work from real researchers alongside junk science.](#)
160. [On predatory academic journals and conferences.](#)
161. [AI research journal with sham board, metrics holds researcher's paper hostage.](#)
162. [Predatory and other questionable practices in scholarly communication.](#)
163. [MDPI.](#)
164. [Scientific Articles Accepted \(Personal Checks, Too\).](#)

165. [Predatory journals and academic pollution.](#)
166. [Exposing the predators. Methods to stop predatory journals.](#)

11 Predatory, Questionable and Fake Conferences

1. E. Elmacioglu; D. Lee. Oracle, where shall I submit my papers?, 2009. DOI: [10.1145/1461928.1461958](#)
2. J.D. Bowman. Predatory Publishing, Questionable Peer Review, and Fraudulent Conferences, 2014. DOI: [10.5688/ajpe7810176](#)
3. A. Ruben. Dubious conferences put the ‘pose’ in ‘symposium’, 2016. DOI: [10.1126/science.caredit.a1600157](#)
4. A. Asadi; N. Rahbar; M.J. Rezvani; F. Asadi. Fake/Bogus Conferences: Their Features and Some Subtle Ways to Differentiate Them from Real Ones, 2017. DOI: [10.1007/s11948-017-9906-2](#)
5. P.E. Cress. Are Predatory Conferences the Dark Side of the Open Access Movement?, 2017. DOI: [10.1093/asj/sjw247](#)
6. P. Darbyshire. Fake news. Fake journals. Fake conferences. What we can do, 2017. DOI: [10.1111/jocn.14214](#)
7. A.R. Memon; M.E. Azim. Predatory conferences: Addressing researchers from developing countries, 2018. PMID: [30410151](#)
8. E. Mercier; P.-A. Tardif; L. Moore; N. Le Sage; P.A. Cameron. Invitations received from potential predatory publishers and fraudulent conferences: a 12-month early-career researcher experience, 2018. DOI: [10.1136/postgradmedj-2017-135097](#)
9. A. Asadi. Invitation to Speak at a Conference: The Tempting Technique Adopted by Predatory Conferences’ Organizers, 2018. DOI: [10.1007/s11948-018-0038-0](#)
10. M. Pawar. Predatory conferences: Caveat emptor!, 2018. DOI: [10.1111/jdv.14855](#)
11. J. McCrostie. Predatory Conferences: A Case of Academic Cannibalism, 2018. DOI: [10.6017/ihe.0.93.10425](#)
12. A. Grant. The proliferation of questionable conferences, 2018. DOI: [10.1063/PT.6.2.20180718a](#)
13. M.D. Krasowski; J.C. Lawrence; A.S. Briggs; B.A. Ford. Burden and Characteristics of Unsolicited Emails from Medical/Scientific Journals, Conferences, and Webinars to Faculty and Trainees at an Academic Pathology Department, 2019. DOI: [10.4103/jpi.jpi_12_19](#)

14. M. Zastrow. South Korea clamps down on academics attending ‘weak’ conferences, 2019. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-019-03372-z](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-019-03372-z)
15. R. Lang; M. Mintz; H.B. Krentz; M.J. Gill. An approach to conference selection and evaluation: advice to avoid "predatory" conferences, 2019. DOI: [10.1007/s11192-018-2981-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-018-2981-6)
16. T.K. Erdag. Be Aware of Predatory/Fake Conferences!, 2019. DOI: [10.5152/tao.2019.969878](https://doi.org/10.5152/tao.2019.969878)
17. Z. Kocak. Precise and Immediate Action against Predatory Conferences, 2020. DOI: [10.4274/balkanmedj.galenos.2020.2020.1.001](https://doi.org/10.4274/balkanmedj.galenos.2020.2020.1.001)
18. S. Ibrahim; A. Saw. The Perils of Predatory Journals and Conferences, 2020. DOI: [10.5704/MOJ.2007.003](https://doi.org/10.5704/MOJ.2007.003)
19. A. Cortegiani; A. Manca; A. Giarratano. Predatory journals and conferences: why fake counts, 2020. DOI: [10.1097/ACO.0000000000000829](https://doi.org/10.1097/ACO.0000000000000829)
20. S. Ebadi; S. Ashtarian; G. Zamani. Exploring Arguments Presented in Predatory Journals Using Toulmin’s Model of Argumentation, 2020. DOI: [10.1007/s10805-019-09346-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-019-09346-0)
21. C. Sonne; Y.S. Ok; S.S. Lam; et al. First predatory journals, now conferences: The need to establish lists of fake conferences, 2020. DOI: [10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.136990](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.136990)
22. F. Nisha; A.K. Das; M. Tripathi. Stemming the rising tide of predatory journals and conferences: A selective review of literature, 2020. DOI: [10.56042/alis.v67i3.32442](https://doi.org/10.56042/alis.v67i3.32442)
23. J. McCrostie. Our Predatory Conference Problem, 2020. DOI: [10.1163/9789004433885_007](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004433885_007)
24. A. Latimer. Predatory Conferences: What Social Workers Need to Know, 2021. DOI: [10.1080/10437797.2021.1977754](https://doi.org/10.1080/10437797.2021.1977754)
25. D. Pecorari. Predatory Conferences: What Are the Signs?, 2021. DOI: [10.1007/s10805-021-09406-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-021-09406-4)
26. T. Godskesen; S. Eriksson; H. Oermann; S. Gabrielsson. Predatory conferences: a systematic scoping review, 2022. DOI: [10.1136/bmjopen-2022-062425](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2022-062425)
27. E. Kulczycki; M. Holowiecki; Z. Taskin; G. Dogan. Questionable conferences and presenters from top-ranked universities, 2022. DOI: [10.1177/01655515221087674](https://doi.org/10.1177/01655515221087674)
28. J.H. Lee; T.Y. Kim; J.H. Jeon; et al. Science-Adjacent Conferences: Beware of Predatory Conferences, 2022. DOI: [10.18502/ijph.v51i3.8950](https://doi.org/10.18502/ijph.v51i3.8950)
29. T. Elliott; B. Fazeen; A. Asrat; et al. Perceptions on the prevalence and impact of predatory academic journals and conferences: A global survey of researchers, 2022. DOI: [10.1002/leap.1458](https://doi.org/10.1002/leap.1458)
30. T.Y. Chen. PreDefense: Defending Underserved AI Students and Researchers from

- Predatory Conferences, 2022. DOI: [10.48550/arXiv.2201.13268](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2201.13268)
31. S. Leducq; N. Bonsu; K. Clement; R. Barlow; H.C. Williams. Predator and Alien: the threat of predatory journals and conferences, 2023. DOI: [10.1093/ced/llad133](https://doi.org/10.1093/ced/llad133)
 32. C. Ro. How to spot a predatory conference, and what science needs to do about them: a guide, 2024. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-024-02360-2](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-024-02360-2)
 33. C. Ro. What is it like to attend a predatory conference?, 2024. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-024-02358-w](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-024-02358-w)
 34. Predatory conferences are on the rise. Here are five ways to tackle them, 2024. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-024-02445-y](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-024-02445-y)
 35. T.W. Wong. My identity was stolen by a predatory conference, 2024. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-024-03024-x](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-024-03024-x)
 36. U. Pidvalna; O. Zimba; O. Chevchik; et al. Circumventing predatory conferences and predatory journals in medical sciences issues by bogus agencies, 2024. DOI: [10.25040/ntsh2024.01.03](https://doi.org/10.25040/ntsh2024.01.03)
37. [Combatting Predatory Academic Journals and Conferences.](#)
 38. [Predatory conference.](#)
 39. [The Alarming Rise of Predatory Conferences.](#)
 40. [The Great Scam of the fake "Annual International Congresses".](#)
 41. [Predatory Publishing: What are predatory conferences?.](#)
 42. [Predatory Publishing: Predatory Conferences.](#)
 43. [Predatory Conferences.](#)
 44. [How to Spot a Fake Conference in 2024.](#)
 45. [10 Tips to Spot Fake Conferences.](#)
 46. [9 Signs a conference is fake.](#)
 47. [How to avoid predatory conferences.](#)
 48. [Where Should I Publish? : Identifying Predatory Conferences.](#)
 49. [Combatting Predatory Academic Journals and Conferences.](#)
 50. [The Ultimate Guide to Avoiding Predatory Conferences.](#)
 51. [Planes, trams, and auditoriums: Beware predatory conferencing.](#)
 52. [Media probes raise questions over quality of conferences.](#)
 53. [Predatory Conferences: A Lesser-known \(But No Less Dangerous\) Predatory Publishing Scam.](#)
 54. [Predatory meetings and how to avoid them.](#)
 55. [Inside a "Fake" Conference: A Journey Into Predatory Science.](#)

56. [Exposing predatory conferences.](#)
57. [How to avoid predatory/fake congresses.](#)
58. [Is there any platform to report predatory journals and fake conferences?.](#)
59. [List of current predatory/fake congresses?.](#)
60. [Questionable Conferences.](#)
61. [Poor-quality, predatory conferences prey on academics.](#)
62. [Welcome to a fake scientific conference, the best way to extort money from scientists: ‘I feel cheated’.](#)
63. [On predatory academic journals and conferences.](#)
64. [Red-Flag Conferences.](#)
65. [‘Predatory conferences’ stalk Japan’s groves of academia.](#)
66. [Avoiding Predatory Journals and Questionable Conferences: A Resource Guide.](#)
67. [Predatory conferences: A to Z elements.](#)
68. [What is it like to attend a predatory conference?.](#)
69. [Predatory conferences - A case of academic cannibalism.](#)
70. [The Rise of Predatory Conferences: A Call to Action for Academic Publishers.](#)
71. [What are questionable conferences.](#)
72. [What are predatory publishers & predatory conferences?.](#)
73. [The Complexity of The Questionable: Fighting the battle against ‘predatory conferences’.](#)
74. [Avoiding Predatory Journals and Questionable Conferences: A Resource Guide.](#)
75. [OMICS Group Conferences - Sham or Scam? \(Either way, don’t go to one!\).](#)
76. [Predatory Conferences Undermine Science And Scam Academics.](#)
77. [A Peek Inside the Strange World of Fake Academia.](#)
78. [What happens in those ‘scam’ conferences?.](#)
79. [Know Before You Go: Red Flags of a Fake Conference.](#)
80. [Korean gov’t inspection found over 1300 professors and researchers attended ‘fake conferences’.](#)
81. [What are the good indicators of fake conferences?.](#)
82. [Predatory conference scammers are getting smarter.](#)
83. [How predatory scientific conferences prey on researchers: A case study.](#)

12 Journal Hijacking

1. M. Jalalian; H. Mahboobi. Hijacked Journals and Predatory Publishers: Is There a Need to Re-Think How to Assess the Quality of Academic Research?, 2014. DOI: [10.14456/WJST.2014.16](https://doi.org/10.14456/WJST.2014.16)
2. J. Bohannon. Feature: How to hijack a journal, 2015. DOI: [10.1126/science.aad7463](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aad7463)
3. M. Jalalian; M. Dadkhah. The full story of 90 hijacked journals from August 2011 to June 2015, 2015. DOI: [10.5937/GeoPan1502073J](https://doi.org/10.5937/GeoPan1502073J)
4. B. Nieradko-Iwanicka. Warning: hijacked journals, 2015. DOI: [10.20452/pamw.2987](https://doi.org/10.20452/pamw.2987)
5. R. Watson. Hijackers on the open access highway, 2015. DOI: [10.1002/nop2.36](https://doi.org/10.1002/nop2.36)
6. M. Dadkhah; T. Maliszewski; M.D. Jazi. Characteristics of Hijacked Journals and Predatory Publishers: Our Observations in the Academic World, 2016. DOI: [10.1016/j.tips.2016.04.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tips.2016.04.002)
7. M. Dadkhah; G. Borchardt. Hijacked Journals: An Emerging Challenge for Scholarly Publishing, 2016. DOI: [10.1093/asj/sjw026](https://doi.org/10.1093/asj/sjw026)
8. M. Dadkhah; T. Maliszewski; V.V. Lyashenko. An approach for preventing the indexing of hijacked journal articles in scientific databases, 2016. DOI: [10.1080/0144929X.2015.1128975](https://doi.org/10.1080/0144929X.2015.1128975)
9. M. Dadkhah; T. Maliszewski; J.A.T. da Silva. Hijacked journals, hijacked web-sites, journal phishing, misleading metrics, and predatory publishing: actual and potential threats to academic integrity and publishing ethics, 2016. DOI: [10.1007/s12024-016-9785-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12024-016-9785-x)
10. T.G.S. Martins; A.L.F.A. Costa; F.J.S. Moncada; R.V. Martins. Hijacked scientific journals: a warning to researchers, 2016. DOI: [10.1590/S1679-45082016CE3632](https://doi.org/10.1590/S1679-45082016CE3632)
11. M.A. Shahri; M.D. Jazi; G. Borchardt; M. Dadkhah. Detecting Hijacked Journals by Using Classification Algorithms, 2017. DOI: [10.1007/s11948-017-9914-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-017-9914-2)
12. V.G. Menon; M.R. Khosravi. Preventing hijacked research papers in fake (rogue) journals through social media and databases, 2019. DOI: [10.1108/LHTN-11-2018-0070](https://doi.org/10.1108/LHTN-11-2018-0070)
13. S. Moussa. Journal hijacking: Challenges and potential solutions, 2021. DOI: [10.1002/leap.1412](https://doi.org/10.1002/leap.1412)
14. M.R. Khosravi; V.G. Menon. Reliability of Hijacked Journal Detection Based on Scientometrics, Altmetric Tools, and Web Informatics: A Case Report Using Google Scholar, Web of Science, and Scopus, 2021. DOI: [10.1155/2021/1631496](https://doi.org/10.1155/2021/1631496)
15. S. Moussa. A "Trojan horse" in the reference lists: Citations to a hijacked journal in SSCI-indexed marketing journals, 2021. DOI: [10.1016/j.acalib.2021.102388](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2021.102388)

16. M. Dadkhah; F. Rahimnia; P. Darbyshire; G. Borchardt. Ten (Bad) reasons researchers publish their papers in hijacked journals, 2021. DOI: [10.1111/jocn.15947](https://doi.org/10.1111/jocn.15947)
17. A. Abalkina. Detecting a network of hijacked journals by its archive, 2021. DOI: [10.1007/s11192-021-04056-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-021-04056-0)
18. H.A. Abid; E.A. Yousif. Hijacked journals: Tips for young researchers, to detect and avoid them, 2022. DOI: [10.47419/bjbabs.v3i04.179](https://doi.org/10.47419/bjbabs.v3i04.179)
19. A. Abalkina; G. Cabanac; C. Labbe; A. Magazinov. Improper legitimization of hijacked journals through citations, 2022. DOI: [10.48550/arXiv.2209.04703](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2209.04703)
20. H. Else. Hijacked-journal tracker helps researchers to spot scam websites, 2022. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-022-01666-3](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-022-01666-3)
21. S.D. Muller; J. I. Saebo. The ‘hijacking’ of the Scandinavian Journal of Information Systems: Implications for the information systems community, 2023. DOI: [10.1111/isj.12481](https://doi.org/10.1111/isj.12481)
22. A. Abalkina. Challenges posed by hijacked journals in Scopus, 2023. DOI: [10.1002/asi.24855](https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.24855)
23. J. Brainard. Leading scholarly database listed hundreds of papers from ‘hijacked’ journals, 2023. DOI: [10.1126/science.zcgp0a2](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.zcgp0a2)
24. S. Moussa. Journal hijacking: Journal of Philanthropy and Marketing as a victim and the impacts, 2023. DOI: [10.1002/nvsm.1817](https://doi.org/10.1002/nvsm.1817)
25. J. Ryan. Hijacked journals are still a threat - here’s what publishers can do about them, 2024. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-024-02399-1](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-024-02399-1)
26. A. Abalkina. Prevalence of plagiarism in hijacked journals: A text similarity analysis, 2024. DOI: [10.1080/08989621.2024.2387210](https://doi.org/10.1080/08989621.2024.2387210)
27. D. Hammett; G. Williams; B. Dockerill; et al. Responding to the growing issue of ‘journal hijacking’, 2024. DOI: [10.3828/idpr.2024.19](https://doi.org/10.3828/idpr.2024.19)
28. M. Hegedus; M. Dadkhah; L.D. David. Masquerade of authority: hijacked journals are gaining more credibility than original ones, 2024. DOI: [10.1515/dx-2024-0082](https://doi.org/10.1515/dx-2024-0082)
29. M. Hegedus; M. Dadkhah; L.D. David. A Decade in Hijacked Journals: What Will be the Future Trend?, 2024. DOI: [10.34172/apb.44002](https://doi.org/10.34172/apb.44002)
30. M. Hegedus; M. Dadkhah; L.D. David. Unmasking Greenwashing: Mapping Hijacked Medicine Journals to the Sustainable Development Goals, 2024. DOI: [10.34172/apb.43763](https://doi.org/10.34172/apb.43763)
31. M. Dadkhah; M.H. Oermann; M. Hegedus; et al. Detecting New Hijacked Journals by Using a List of Known Hijacked Journals and the Diagnosis of Web Domain Data, 2024. DOI: [10.1080/00987913.2024.2411664](https://doi.org/10.1080/00987913.2024.2411664)
32. M.L. Graber; M. Plebani. The growing threat of hijacked journals, 2024.

[DOI: 10.1515/dx-2024-0103](https://doi.org/10.1515/dx-2024-0103)

33. U.Y. Parray; F.A. Loan; A.M. Khan. The dark side of publishing: Unveiling the deceptive tactics of cloned journals in India, 2024. [DOI: 10.1177/09610006241256392](https://doi.org/10.1177/09610006241256392)
34. V. Sahni. Journal hijacking, 2025. [DOI: 10.1038/s41415-025-8343-x](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41415-025-8343-x)
35. Journal hijacking.
36. Publishing: Predatory Publishers and Conferences: What is Journal Hijacking?.
37. Are you submitting to an authentic scholarly journal?.
38. The Retraction Watch Hijacked Journal Checker.
39. The Whack-a-Mole problem: Hijacked journal still being indexed in Scopus even after discovery.
40. Hijacked journals: what they are and how to avoid them.
41. The pitfalls of publishing - scholarly journal hijacking on the rise.
42. Want to know whether that journal is scamming you? Introducing the Retraction Watch Hijacked Journal Checker.
43. Study finds high plagiarism levels in ‘hijacked journals’.
44. Beall’s List of Potential Predatory Journals and Publishers: Hijacked Journals.
45. Journal of the Iceland Glaciological and Geological Societies.
46. How hijacked journals keep fooling one of the world’s leading databases.
47. How many times can a journal be hijacked?.
48. How did content from a hijacked journal end up in one of the world’s most-used databases?.
49. The Journal of Research on the Lepidoptera: A Story of Pirate Publishers, ISSN Hijacking and Fraudulent DOI Assignment.
50. WHO COVID-19 library contains hundreds of papers from hijacked journals.
51. In Web of Science we trust - A case of a hijacked journal indexed in SCOPUS.
52. Three journals’ web domains expired. Then major indexes pointed to hijacked versions.
53. Hijacked journals: A challenge unaddressed to the developing world.
54. Predatory publishing: Journal hijacking.
55. Meet the hijacked journal that keeps rising from the ashes.
56. Do hijacked journals attract dishonest authors?.
57. Hijacked journals as a nuisance to the scientific community.
58. Challenges posed by hijacked journals in Scopus.
59. Scopus Addresses Hijacked Journal Sites.
60. Hijacked journals in Scopus.

61. [How journal hijackers derail academic careers with impunity.](#)
62. [The persistence of journal hijacking and how to fight back.](#)
63. [Weekend reads: Cassava's Alzheimer's drug fails; new journal hijacking scam; Hong Kong academic jailed.](#)
64. [The Rising Threat of Journal Hijacking and Cloned Websites in Scholarly Publishing: A Call to Action.](#)
65. [What you need to know about hijacked journals.](#)
66. [Use Lean Library to detect hijacked journals.](#)
67. [Tips for identifying and avoiding hijacked journals.](#)
68. [Update: A Journal Hijacking.](#)
69. [Exclusive: New hijacking scam targets Elsevier, Springer Nature, and other major publishers.](#)
70. [How to Spot and Avoid Hijacked Journals: A Guide for Academics.](#)
71. [There was an attempt to hijack a journal....](#)
72. [What Are the Dangers of Publishing in a Hijacked Journal?.](#)
73. [Hijacked Journals are Plaguing the Science: A Strategy to Identify a "Hijacked Journal".](#)
74. [Scientific Cyber Fraud: Nobody Move - We're Taking Over This Journal!.](#)
75. [My journal was hijacked: an editor's experience.](#)
76. [List of Hijacked Journals.](#)
77. [Hijacked journals 'siphon millions of dollars' from research.](#)
78. [Retraction Watch Hijacked Journals Checker.](#)

13 Gibberish Papers

1. S. Hilgartner. The Sokal Affair in Context, 1997. DOI: [10.1177/016224399702200404](#)
2. S.S. Schweber. Reflections on the Sokal Affair: What Is at Stake?, 1997. DOI: [10.1063/1.881695](#)
3. A. Ross. Reflections on the Sokal Affair, 1997. DOI: [10.2307/466826](#)
4. P. Ball. Computer conference welcomes gobbledegook paper, 2005. DOI: [10.1038/nature03653](#)
5. S. Kelly-Bootle. Call That Gibberish?: Detecting the real from the fake is getting harder, 2005. DOI: [10.1145/1080862.1080884](#)
6. E. Elmacioglu; D. Lee. Oracle, where shall I submit my papers?, 2009. DOI: [10.1145/1461928.1461958](#)

7. Editorial. Editor to quit over hoax open-access paper, 2009. DOI: [10.1038/459901a](https://doi.org/10.1038/459901a)
8. N. Gilbert. Editor will quit over hoax paper, 2009. DOI: [10.1038/news.2009.571](https://doi.org/10.1038/news.2009.571)
9. C. Labbé; D. Labbé. Duplicate and fake publications in the scientific literature: how many SCIdgen papers in computer science?, 2013. DOI: [10.1007/s11192-012-0781-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-012-0781-y)
10. R. Van Noorden. Publishers withdraw more than 120 gibberish papers, 2014. DOI: [10.1038/nature.2014.14763](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature.2014.14763)
11. R. Van Noorden. Hundreds of gibberish papers still lurk in the scientific literature, 2021. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-021-01436-7](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-021-01436-7)
12. G. Cabanac; C. Labbe. Prevalence of nonsensical algorithmically generated papers in the scientific literature, 2021. DOI: [10.1002/asi.24495](https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.24495)
13. H. Else. ‘Tortured phrases’ give away fabricated research papers, 2021. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-021-02134-0](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-021-02134-0)
14. G. Cabanac; C. Labbé; A. Magazinov. Tortured phrases: A dubious writing style emerging in science. Evidence of critical issues affecting established journals, 2021. DOI: [10.48550/arXiv.2107.06751](https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2107.06751)
15. J.A.T. da Silva. "Tortured phrases" in preprints, 2023. DOI: [10.1080/03007995.2023.2201098](https://doi.org/10.1080/03007995.2023.2201098)
16. Z. Faulkes (Editor). Stinging the Predators: A collection of papers that should never have been published, 2025. DOI: [10.6084/m9.figshare.5248264](https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.5248264)
17. How a fake-paper generator tricked scientific journals, 20 years later.
18. SCIdgen - An Automatic CS Paper Generator.
19. SCIdgen.
20. Mathgen: Randomly generated mathematics research papers!.
21. The Rise of AI-Generated Fake Science Papers Threatens Academic Integrity and Medical Research.
22. "Bosom peril" is not "breast cancer": How weird computer-generated phrases help researchers find scientific publishing fraud.
23. In the beginning it was just plagiarism - now its computer-generated fake papers as well.
24. More Computer-Generated Nonsense Papers Pulled From Science Journals.
25. Open Access Publisher Accepts Nonsense Manuscript for Dollars.
26. All these papers were deliberately bad.
27. Science publisher fooled by gibberish papers.
28. How Gobbledygook Ended Up in Respected Scientific Journals.
29. How three MIT students fooled the world of scientific journals.

30. [Gibberish papers persist; the academic who faked Cherokee heritage; ‘organised fraud hits scientific journals’.](#)
31. [Springer Nature geosciences journal retracts 44 articles filled with gibberish.](#)
32. [The War Against Gibberish.](#)
33. [How, exactly, to construct a gibberish paper that gets accepted by journals.](#)
34. [Nature News reports SCIdgen gibberish papers; can we rely on conventional peer-review? Or can machines help?.](#)
35. [Just a few \(i.e. 120\) "gibberish" research papers redacted.](#)
36. [When Scientific Papers Are, Literally, Gibberish.](#)
37. [Peer Gibberish.](#)
38. [Spitting out the AI Gobbledygook sandwich: a suggestion for publishers.](#)
39. [How computer-generated fake papers are flooding academia.](#)
40. [Science With the Gobbledygook.](#)
41. [Blinded by scientific gobbledygook.](#)
42. [Academia Still Has a Terrible Gobbledygook Problem.](#)
43. [Sokal affair.](#)
44. [Sokal’s Hoax.](#)
45. [The Sokal affair.](#)
46. [How Alan Sokal Won the Battle but Lost the ‘Science Wars’.](#)
47. [What an Audacious Hoax Reveals About Academia.](#)
48. [A Massive Hoax Involving 20 Fake Culture Studies Papers Just Exploded in Academia.](#)
49. [These Academics Submitted 20 Fake Papers To Journals. This Is What Happened.](#)

14 Retraction

1. J.M. Budd; M. Sievert; T.R. Schultz. Phenomena of Retraction: Reasons for Retraction and Citations to the Publications, 1998. DOI: [10.1001/jama.280.3.296](#)
2. A. Abbott; J. Schwarz. Dubious data remain in print two years after misconduct inquiry, 2002. DOI: [10.1038/418113a](#)
3. A. Abbott. Retraction ends furore over cancer vaccine, 2003. DOI: [10.1038/425004a](#)
4. Editorial. Retractions’ realities, 2003. DOI: [10.1038/422001a](#)
5. P.B. Fontanarosa; C.D. DeAngelis. Correcting the Literature - Retraction and Republication, 2005. DOI: [10.1001/jama.293.20.2536](#)
6. E. Marcus. Retraction Controversy, 2005. DOI: [10.1016/j.cell.2005.10.007](#)

7. H.C. Sox; D. Rennie. Research Misconduct, Retraction, and Cleansing the Medical Literature: Lessons from the Poehlman Case, 2006.
DOI: [10.7326/0003-4819-144-8-200604180-00123](https://doi.org/10.7326/0003-4819-144-8-200604180-00123)
8. H.C. Sox; D. Rennie. Research Misconduct, Retraction, and Cleansing the Medical Literature: Lessons from the Poehlman Case, 2006.
DOI: [10.7326/0003-4819-144-8-200604180-00123](https://doi.org/10.7326/0003-4819-144-8-200604180-00123)
9. A. Poulton. Mistakes and misconduct in the research literature: retractions just the tip of the iceberg, 2007. DOI: [10.5694/j.1326-5377.2007.tb00917.x](https://doi.org/10.5694/j.1326-5377.2007.tb00917.x)
10. A. Poulton. Mistakes and misconduct in the research literature: retractions just the tip of the iceberg, 2007. DOI: [10.5694/j.1326-5377.2007.tb00917.x](https://doi.org/10.5694/j.1326-5377.2007.tb00917.x)
11. B.K. Redman; H.N. Yarandi; J.F. Merz. Empirical developments in retraction, 2008.
DOI: [10.1136/jme.2007.023069](https://doi.org/10.1136/jme.2007.023069)
12. N.A. Trikalinos; E. Evangelou; J.P.A. Ioannidis. Falsified papers in high-impact journals were slow to retract and indistinguishable from nonfraudulent papers, 2008. DOI: [10.1016/j.jclinepi.2007.11.019](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2007.11.019)
13. N.E. Drury; D.M. Karamanou. Citation of Retracted Articles: A Call for Vigilance, 2009. DOI: [10.1016/j.athoracsur.2008.07.108](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.athoracsur.2008.07.108)
14. N. Jones. Analysis of retractions puts spotlight on academia, 2009.
DOI: [10.1038/nm1009-1101](https://doi.org/10.1038/nm1009-1101)
15. Editorial. A painful remedy, 2010. DOI: [10.1038/468006b](https://doi.org/10.1038/468006b)
16. F.C. Fang; A. Casadevall. Retracted Science and the Retraction Index, 2011. DOI: [10.1128/IAI.05661-11](https://doi.org/10.1128/IAI.05661-11)
17. R.G. Steen. Retractions in the scientific literature: is the incidence of research fraud increasing?, 2011. DOI: [10.1136/jme.2010.040923](https://doi.org/10.1136/jme.2010.040923)
18. R.G. Steen. Misinformation in the medical literature: What role do error and fraud play?, 2011. DOI: [10.1136/jme.2010.041830](https://doi.org/10.1136/jme.2010.041830)
19. R.G. Steen. Retractions in the medical literature: how many patients are put at risk by flawed research?, 2011. DOI: [10.1136/jme.2011.043133](https://doi.org/10.1136/jme.2011.043133)
20. R.G. Steen. Retractions in the scientific literature: do authors deliberately commit research fraud?, 2011. DOI: [10.1136/jme.2010.038125](https://doi.org/10.1136/jme.2010.038125)
21. E. Wager; P. Williams. Why and how do journals retract articles? An analysis of Medline retractions 1988-2008, 2011. DOI: [10.1136/jme.2010.040964](https://doi.org/10.1136/jme.2010.040964)
22. R. Van Noorden. Science publishing: The trouble with retractions, 2011.
DOI: [10.1038/478026a](https://doi.org/10.1038/478026a)
23. T. He. Retraction of global scientific publications from 2001 to 2010, 2012. DOI: [10.1038/nrn3281a](https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn3281a)

[10.1007/s11192-012-0906-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-012-0906-3)

24. S.F. Karabag; C. Berggren. Retraction, Dishonesty and Plagiarism: Analysis of a Crucial Issue for Academic Publishing, and the Inadequate Responses from Leading Journals in Economics and Management Disciplines, 2012.
Source: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2190694
25. M. Zhang; M.L. Grieneisen. The impact of misconduct on the published medical and non-medical literature, and the news media, 2012. DOI: [10.1007/s11192-012-0920-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-012-0920-5)
26. F.C. Fang; R.G. Steen; A. Casadevall. Misconduct accounts for the majority of retracted scientific publications, 2012. DOI: [10.1073/pnas.1212247109](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1212247109)
27. M.L. Grieneisen; M. Zhang. A Comprehensive Survey of Retracted Articles from the Scholarly Literature, 2012. DOI: [10.1371/journal.pone.0044118](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0044118)
28. R.G. Steen; A. Casadevall; F.C. Fang. Why has the number of scientific retractions increased?, 2013. DOI: [10.1371/journal.pone.0068397](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0068397)
29. N. Elia; E. Wager; M.R. Tramer. Fate of articles that warranted retraction due to ethical concerns: a descriptive cross-sectional study, 2014. DOI: [10.1371/journal.pone.0085846](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0085846)
30. A. Marcus; I. Oransky. What Studies of Retractions Tell Us, 2014.
DOI: [10.1128/jmbe.v15i2.855](https://doi.org/10.1128/jmbe.v15i2.855)
31. E. Callaway. Faked peer reviews prompt 64 retractions, 2015.
DOI: [10.1038/nature.2015.18202](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature.2015.18202)
32. R.M.V.R. Almeida; K. de Albuquerque Rocha; F. Catelani; et al. Plagiarism Allegations Account for Most Retractions in Major Latin American/Caribbean Databases, 2015.
DOI: [10.1007/s11948-015-9714-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-015-9714-5)
33. O. Dyer. Major publisher retracts 43 papers, alleging fake peer review, 2015. DOI: [10.1136/bmj.h1783](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.h1783)
34. E. Callaway. Publisher pulls 58 articles by Iranian scientists over authorship manipulation, 2016. DOI: [10.1038/nature.2016.20916](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature.2016.20916)
35. F. Hesselmann; V. Graf; M. Schmidt; M. Reinhart. The visibility of scientific misconduct: A review of the literature on retracted journal articles, 2016.
DOI: [10.1177/0011392116663807](https://doi.org/10.1177/0011392116663807)
36. J. Han; Z. Li. How Metrics-Based Academic Evaluation Could Systematically Induce Academic Misconduct: A Case Study, 2017. DOI: [10.1215/18752160-4275144](https://doi.org/10.1215/18752160-4275144)
37. X. Qi; H. Deng; X. Guo. Characteristics of retractions related to faked peer reviews: an overview, 2017. DOI: [10.1136/postgradmedj-2016-133969](https://doi.org/10.1136/postgradmedj-2016-133969)
38. T. Stigbrand. Retraction Note to multiple articles in Tumor Biology, 2017. DOI: [10.1007/s13277-017-5487-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/s13277-017-5487-6)

39. J.A.T. da Silva; H. Bornemann-Cimenti. Why do some retracted papers continue to be cited?, 2017. DOI: [10.1007/s11192-016-2178-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-016-2178-9)
40. R. Rai; S. Sabharwal. Retracted Publications in Orthopaedics: Prevalence, Characteristics, and Trends, 2017. DOI: [10.2106/JBJS.16.01116](https://doi.org/10.2106/JBJS.16.01116)
41. E.G. King; I. Oransky; T.E. Sachs; et al. Analysis of retracted articles in the surgical literature, 2018. DOI: [10.1016/j.amjsurg.2017.11.033](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amjsurg.2017.11.033)
42. K.B. Wray; L.E. Andersen. Retractions in Science, 2018. DOI: [10.1007/s11192-018-2922-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-018-2922-4)
43. J. Brainard; J. You. What a massive database of retracted papers reveals about science publishing's 'death penalty', 2018. DOI: [10.1126/science.aav8384](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aav8384)
44. S. Xu; G. Hu. Retraction Notices: Who Authored Them?, 2018. DOI: [10.3390/publications6010002](https://doi.org/10.3390/publications6010002)
45. J.A.T. da Silva; A. Al-Khatib. Ending the retraction stigma: Encouraging the reporting of errors in the biomedical record, 2019. DOI: [10.1177/1747016118802970](https://doi.org/10.1177/1747016118802970)
46. J.D. Mena; M. Ndoeye; A.J. Cohen; et al. The landscape of urological retractions: the prevalence of reported research misconduct, 2019. DOI: [10.1111/bju.14706](https://doi.org/10.1111/bju.14706)
47. I. Campos-Varela; A. Ruano-Ravina. Misconduct as the main cause for retraction. A descriptive study of retracted publications and their authors, 2019. DOI: [10.1016/j.gaceta.2018.01.009](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gaceta.2018.01.009)
48. R. Craig; A. Cox; D. Tourish; A. Thorpe. Using retracted journal articles in psychology to understand research misconduct in the social sciences: What is to be done?, 2020. DOI: [10.1016/j.respol.2020.103930](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2020.103930)
49. M.J. Bolland; A. Grey; A. Avenell. Citation of retracted publications: A challenging problem, 2021. DOI: [10.1080/08989621.2021.1886933](https://doi.org/10.1080/08989621.2021.1886933)
50. G. Cabanac; C. Labbe. Prevalence of nonsensical algorithmically generated papers in the scientific literature, 2021. DOI: [10.1002/asi.24495](https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.24495)
51. S.L. Boughton; J. Wilkinson; L. Bero. When beauty is but skin deep: dealing with problematic studies in systematic reviews, 2021. DOI: [10.1002/14651858.ED000152](https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.ED000152)
52. J.A.T. da Silva. How to shape academic freedom in the digital age? Are the retractions of opinionated papers a prelude to "cancel culture" in academia?, 2021. DOI: [10.1016/j.crbeha.2021.100035](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crbeha.2021.100035)
53. S. Serghiou; R.M. Marton; J.P.A. Ioannidis. Media and social media attention to retracted articles according to Altmetric, 2021. DOI: [10.1371/journal.pone.0248625](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0248625)
54. H. Rivera; J.A.T. da Silva. Retractions, Fake Peer Reviews, and Paper Mills, 2021. DOI: [10.3346/jkms.2021.36.e165](https://doi.org/10.3346/jkms.2021.36.e165)

55. C. Lievore; P. Rubbo; C.B. dos Santos; et al. Research ethics: a profile of retractions from world class universities, 2021. DOI: [10.1007/s11192-021-03987-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-021-03987-y)
56. Y. Kataoka; M. Banno; Y. Tsujimoto; et al. Retracted randomized controlled trials were cited and not corrected in systematic reviews and clinical practice guidelines, 2022. DOI: [10.1016/j.jclinepi.2022.06.015](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2022.06.015)
57. C. Candal-Pedreira; J.S. Ross; A. Ruano-Ravina; et al. Retracted papers originating from paper mills: cross sectional study, 2022. DOI: [10.1136/bmj-2022-071517](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj-2022-071517)
58. T. Banerjee; K. Partin; D.B. Resnik. Authorship Issues When Articles are Retracted Due to Research Misconduct and Then Resubmitted, 2022. DOI: [10.1007/s11948-022-00386-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-022-00386-1)
59. A. Avenell; M.J. Bolland; G.D. Gamble; A. Grey. A randomized trial alerting authors, with or without coauthors or editors, that research they cited in systematic reviews and guidelines has been retracted, 2022. DOI: [10.1080/08989621.2022.2082290](https://doi.org/10.1080/08989621.2022.2082290)
60. C.G. Nato; L. Tabacco; F. Bilotta. Fraud and retraction in perioperative medicine publications: what we learned and what can be implemented to prevent future recurrence, 2022. DOI: [10.1136/medethics-2021-107252](https://doi.org/10.1136/medethics-2021-107252)
61. R. Van Noorden. More than 10,000 research papers were retracted in 2023 - a new record, 2023. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-023-03974-8](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-023-03974-8)
62. B.F. Kocyigit; A. Zhaksylyk; A. Akyol; M. Yessirkepov. Characteristics of Retracted Publications From Kazakhstan: An Analysis Using the Retraction Watch Database, 2023. DOI: [10.3346/jkms.2023.38.e390](https://doi.org/10.3346/jkms.2023.38.e390)
63. H. Else. Multimillion-dollar trade in paper authorships alarms publishers, 2023. DOI: [10.1038/d41586-023-00062-9](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-023-00062-9)
64. A. Mokarizadeh. A statement regarding the mass retraction of Iranian papers in November 2016, 2023. DOI: [10.3233/TUB-220031](https://doi.org/10.3233/TUB-220031)
65. J.A.T. da Silva; S. Nazarovets. Assessment of retracted papers, and their retraction notices, from a cancer journal associated with "paper mills", 2023. DOI: [10.2478/jdis-2023-0009](https://doi.org/10.2478/jdis-2023-0009)
66. Pluto Journals. Making the most of retraction, 2023. DOI: [10.13169/prometheus.39.4.0211](https://doi.org/10.13169/prometheus.39.4.0211)
67. C. Candal-Pedreira; C. Guerra-Tort; A. Ruano-Ravina; et al. Retracted papers originating from paper mills: a cross-sectional analysis of references and citations, 2024. DOI: [10.1016/j.jclinepi.2024.111397](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2024.111397)
68. R. Khan; A. Joshi; K. Kaur; A. Sinhababu; R. Chakravarty. Retractions in academic publishing: insights from highly ranked global universities, 2024.

[DOI: 10.1108/GKMC-01-2024-0037](https://doi.org/10.1108/GKMC-01-2024-0037)

69. M. Enserink. ‘It felt very icky’: This scientist’s name was used to write fake peer reviews, 2024. [DOI: 10.1126/science.z5ovm69](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.z5ovm69)
70. Nature Editorial. Retractions are part of science, but misconduct isn’t - lessons from a superconductivity lab, 2024. [DOI: 10.1038/d41586-024-01174-6](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-024-01174-6)
71. H. Else. Biomedical paper retractions have quadrupled in 20 years - why?, 2024. [DOI: 10.1038/d41586-024-01609-0](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-024-01609-0)
72. T. Iqbal. Research article retraction: causes, consequences and preventive measures, 2024. [DOI: 10.69656/pjp.v20i3.1668](https://doi.org/10.69656/pjp.v20i3.1668)
73. C.J. Bakker; E.E. Reardon; S.J. Brown; et al. Identification of retracted publications and completeness of retraction notices in public health, 2024. [DOI: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2024.111427](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2024.111427)
74. M. Srholec. What if your paper were retracted for no credible reason?, 2024. [DOI: 10.1093/reseval/rvae016](https://doi.org/10.1093/reseval/rvae016)
75. E.R. Mattoon; A. Casadevall; F.C. Fang. Retractions of COVID-19-Related Research Publications During and After the Pandemic, 2025. [DOI: 10.1017/jme.2025.33](https://doi.org/10.1017/jme.2025.33)
76. Y.V. Sevryugina; Y. Li. Self-plagiarism: A retrospective study of its prevalence and patterns across scientific disciplines, 2025. [DOI: 10.1080/08989621.2025.2472016](https://doi.org/10.1080/08989621.2025.2472016)
77. H. Studd; A. Grey. Problematic studies have huge impact on healthcare evidence, 2025. [DOI: 10.1136/bmj.r1412](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.r1412)
78. P. Sebo; M. Sebo. Geographical Disparities in Research Misconduct: Analyzing Retraction Patterns by Country, 2025. [DOI: 10.2196/65775](https://doi.org/10.2196/65775)
79. R. Van Noorden. Exclusive: These universities have the most retracted scientific articles, 2025. [DOI: 10.1038/d41586-025-00455-y](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-025-00455-y)
80. J.P.A. Ioannidis; A.M. Pezzullo; A. Cristiano; et al. Linking citation and retraction data reveals the demographics of scientific retractions among highly cited authors, 2025. [DOI: 10.1371/journal.pbio.3002999](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.3002999)
81. S.A. Memon; K. Makovi; B. AlShebli. Characterizing the effect of retractions on publishing careers, 2025. [DOI: 10.1038/s41562-025-02154-0](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-025-02154-0)
82. R.A.K. Richardson; S.S. Hong; J.A. Byrne; et al. The entities enabling scientific fraud at scale are large, resilient, and growing rapidly, 2025. [DOI: 10.1073/pnas.2420092122](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2420092122)
83. [Retraction Watch](#).
84. [Retraction Watch](#).
85. [Top 10 most highly cited retracted papers](#).

86. 'Our deepest apology': Journal retracts 30 likely paper mill articles after investigation published by Retraction Watch.
87. Retractions by Nobel Prize winners.
88. What is the process for retractions?.
89. Exploring the 'Publish or Perish' Mentality and its Impact on Research Paper Retractions.
90. What is the impact of retractions in science?.
91. Nobel prize-winner tallies two more retractions, bringing total to 13.
92. Tenfold increase in scientific research papers retracted for fraud.
93. Hindawi reveals process for retracting more than 8,000 paper mill articles.
94. Wiley and Hindawi to retract 1,200 more papers for compromised peer review.
95. Hindawi's mass retraction of "Special Issues" papers.
96. When can a Journal retract your research paper ? What damage does a retracted paper do to one's academic career?.
97. 'The situation has become appalling': fake scientific papers push research credibility to crisis point.
98. Exclusive: Hindawi and Wiley to retract over 500 papers linked to peer review rings.
99. Major Publisher Retracts 511 Peer Reviewed Scientific Articles.
100. Correcting the record: retracting papermill articles.
101. Reading the Leaves of Publishing Speed: The Cases of Hindawi, Frontiers, and PLOS.
102. From Open Access Pioneer to Retraction Scandal: The Fall of Hindawi.
103. Surge In Academic Retractions Should Put U.S. Scholars On Notice.
104. 10,000 fraudulent articles withdrawn from scientific journals in 2023.
105. Science Journal Pulls 60 Papers in Peer-Review Fraud.
106. Scientific retractions may become easier to spot as Retraction Watch finds new partner.
107. Whistleblowers flagged 300 scientific papers for retraction. Many journals ghosted them.
108. 'The fraud was not subtle': Chemist blames students after ten papers retracted.
109. Paper Retraction: Meaning and Main Reasons.
110. BioMed Central retracting 43 papers for fake peer review.
111. The Plagiarism Epidemic in Russia.
112. The 'publish or perish' mentality is fuelling research paper retractions - and undermining science.
113. When Do Scholarly Retractions Become a Form of Censorship?.
114. An Investigation Showing How Fake Academic Papers Contaminate Scientific Literature.
115. As last of 12 promised Bulfone-Paus retractions appears, a (disappointing) report card

- on journal transparency.
116. [Political censorship in academic journals.](#)
 117. [Ask Retraction Watch: Is it OK to cite a retracted paper?.](#)
 118. [anatomy of a Retraction 2 - Superconductive Fraud.](#)
 119. [Retractions arrive in plagiarism scandal involving economist Nijkamp.](#)
 120. [Retracted coronavirus \(COVID-19\) papers.](#)
 121. [Retractions Increase 10-Fold in 20 Years - and Now AI is Involved.](#)
 122. [60 Articles Retracted After Probe of ‘Peer Review Ring’.](#)
 123. [Just a few \(i.e. 120\) "gibberish" research papers redacted.](#)
 124. [Retraction of false authorship.](#)
 125. [An epidemic of scientific fakery threatens to overwhelm publishers.](#)
 126. [Retraction inaction: How the pandemic has exposed frailties in scientific publishing.](#)
 127. [Plagiarism \(The Scientist\).](#)
 128. [Weekend reads: Article retracted because of "racial characterizations"; India’s high retraction rate; meet the fraud finder.](#)
 129. [Retractions Due to Fake Peer Reviews.](#)
 130. [Major publisher retracts 43 scientific papers amid wider fake peer-review scandal.](#)
 131. [SAGE Publications busts "peer review and citation ring," 60 papers retracted.](#)
 132. [Weekend reads: ‘The Discipline of Last Resort’; universities with the most retractions; ‘patent mills’.](#)
 133. [Retractions up tenfold.](#)
 134. [Journal declines to retract fish research paper despite fraud finding.](#)
 135. [All about Article Retraction in academic publishing.](#)
 136. [Major Science Publisher Admits "Fabricated" Peer Reviews.](#)
 137. [Academic journal retracts articles over ‘peer review ring’ with bogus scholars.](#)
 138. [Scholarly journal retracts 60 articles, smashes ‘peer review ring’.](#)
 139. [Political censorship in academic journals sets a dangerous new precedent.](#)
 140. [Academic journals, journalists perpetuate misinformation in their handling of research retractions, a new study finds.](#)
 141. [Bio journal retracts 107 Chinese research papers: Fake peer reviews cited; uproar reignites questions of credibility.](#)
 142. [Fake Peer Review? Leading journal in robotics retracts six papers from Chinese academics after concluding the process had been subverted.](#)
 143. [Academic journals, journalists perpetuate misinformation in their handling of research retractions, a new study finds.](#)

144. Retraction in academic publishing.
145. Good practice in research: Guidance for researchers on retractions in academic journals 2010.
146. No shame, no blame - How to make retractions work.
147. Identifying Retracted Journal Articles.
148. The Retraction Watch Database.
149. Retractions: the good, the bad, and the ugly. What researchers stand to gain from taking more care to understand errors in the scientific record.
150. Retractions in Academic Publishing and How it Impacts Researchers.
151. What are the most common reasons for retraction?.
152. Ethiopia has highest rate of scientific paper retraction.
153. Should scientists handle retractions differently?.
154. Q. What are retracted articles? How can I find them?.
155. Mistakes happen in research papers. But corrections often don't.
156. How bad is it to have a paper/study of yours retracted?.
157. Web of Science: Searching for Retractions.
158. India's retraction crisis casts shadow over science research.
159. The Top Retractions of 2022.
160. Guest Post - Making Sense of Retractions and Tackling Research Misconduct.
161. There's far more scientific fraud than anyone wants to admit.
162. Fraud in research and the tangible cost of retractions.
163. UKRIO responds to 'Misconduct accounts for the majority of retracted scientific publications'.
164. Fishy science: journal refuses to pull down dodgy research paper.
165. Journal retracts controversial paper on dangers of microplastics to fish.
166. Science retracts coral reef recovery paper more than a year after a report on allegations in its own pages.
167. Scientific fraud, poor research and honest mistakes lead to thousands of retractions.
168. How to Cover Academic Research Fraud and Errors.
169. Unraveling the Truth: How Retractions Shape the Future of Research Integrity.
170. Fraud and plagiarism behind most paper retractions, says a new US study.
171. Retraction because of scientific misconduct even if the conclusions are sound?.
172. China conducts first nationwide review of retractions and research misconduct.
173. Revealed: Harvard publisher cancels entire journal issue on Palestine shortly before publication.

15 Censorship

1. I.M. Verma. Censorship of Scientific Publications: A Bad Idea, 2002.
[DOI: 10.1006/mthe.2002.0569](#)
2. S. Rose. Academic freedom in Israel and Palestine, 2009. [DOI: 10.1038/embor.2009.229](#)
3. A. Casadevall; F.C. Fang. Is Peer Review Censorship?, 2009.
[DOI: 10.1128/IAI.00018-09](#)
4. L. Oates-Indruchova. Self-Censorship and Aesopian Language of Scholarly Texts of Late State Socialism, 2018. [DOI: 10.1353/see.2018.a816246](#)
5. N. Loubere. The New Censorship, the New Academic Freedom: Commercial Publishers and the Chinese Market, 2020. [DOI: 10.25365/jeacs.2020.1.239-252](#)
6. M. Mercer. Self-Censorship and the Academic Mission, 2021. [DOI: 10.51845/34su.2.10](#)
7. J. Wright; A. Avouris; M. Frost; S. Hoffmann. Supporting academic freedom as a human right: challenges and solutions in academic publishing, 2022.
[DOI: 10.1080/13642987.2022.2088520](#)
8. D. Strauss; S. Gran-Ruaz; M. Osman; et al. Racism and censorship in the editorial and peer review process, 2023. [DOI: 10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1120938](#)
9. C.J. Clark; L. Jussim; K. Frey; et al. Prosocial motives underlie scientific censorship by scientists: A perspective and research agenda, 2023. [DOI: 10.1073/pnas.2301642120](#)
10. E. Pokornowski; R.C. Schonfeld. Censorship and Academic Freedom in the Public University Library, 2024. [DOI: 10.18665/sr.320506](#)
11. L. Deeb; J. Winegar. Resistance to Repression and Back Again: The Movement for Palestinian Liberation in US Academia, 2024. [DOI: 10.1080/19436149.2024.2375669](#)
12. H.A. Giroux. Scholasticide: Waging War on Education from Gaza to the West, 2025.
[DOI: 10.3366/hlps.2025.0348](#)
13. D.L. Mann. When Facts Become Forbidden, 2025. [DOI: 10.1016/j.jacbts.2025.02.003](#)
14. N. Leng; E. Plantan. Disappearing Research: Academic Control and Self-Censorship in China, 2025. [DOI: 10.1086/735160](#)
15. [Protecting research from censorship: resources for scholarly publishers.](#)
16. [Political censorship in academic journals sets a dangerous new precedent.](#)
17. [Strategic silencing: how censorship is reshaping scholarly discourse.](#)
18. [Defending Academic Freedom in an Age of Censorship: Why Open Access Matters More Than Ever.](#)
19. [When Do Scholarly Retractions Become a Form of Censorship?.](#)

20. [Defending Academic Freedom in an Age of Censorship: Reflections from author Ash Lierman.](#)
21. [Springer Nature, academic publishing, and the battle against Chinese censorship.](#)
22. [Misusing Editorial Power to Censor Unpopular Research.](#)
23. [‘Censorship’: over 115 scholars condemn cancellation of Harvard journal issue on Palestine.](#)
24. [Political censorship in academic journals.](#)
25. [Birmingham University Bans Gaza Discussion.](#)
26. [Censorship at Scientific American.](#)
27. [Textbooks altered line by line at UK Lawyers for Israel’s behest.](#)
28. [Israel/Palestine and the paradoxes of academic freedom.](#)
29. [A Tale of Two Conferences: On Power, Identity, and Academic Freedom.](#)
30. [The Inhumanity of Academic Freedom.](#)
31. [Is the academic boycott of Israel a violation of academic freedom?.](#)
32. [Activists Mobilize to Fight Censorship and Save Open Science.](#)
33. [Organizations Speak Out Against Trump’s Censorship of Data, Journal Publications.](#)
34. [Chinese state censorship of COVID-19 research represents a looming crisis for academic publishers.](#)
35. [How Publishing House Editors Censor Your Work.](#)
36. [Uncovered: the ‘worsening crackdown’ on pro-Palestine activism at UK universities.](#)
37. [FSU0078 - Evidence on Freedom of Speech in Universities.](#)
38. [The Palestine Exception to Free Speech: A Movement Under Attack in the US.](#)
39. [The Palestine Exception to Free Speech: A Movement Under Attack in the US.](#)
40. [Repression of Palestinian Students in Israeli Universities and Colleges.](#)
41. [Universities develop disturbing patterns of censorship over Palestine.](#)
42. [How Universities Cracked Down on Pro-Palestinian Activism .](#)
43. [British Universities Are Repressing Free Speech on Palestine.](#)
44. [Academic freedom and censorship at our universities: Make your voice heard!.](#)
45. [Recommendations for universities worldwide for the second semester of 2024: Safeguarding the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association on campuses in the context of international solidarity with the Palestinian people and victims.](#)
46. [More than 1,000 US students punished over speech since 2020, report finds.](#)
47. [Gaza has shown European universities are no longer places of free inquiry.](#)
48. [Attacks on Universities over Gaza Protests Threaten Students’ Free Speech.](#)
49. [Chinese state censorship of COVID-19 research represents a looming crisis for academic](#)

[publishers.](#)

50. [The Israeli-Palestinian Conflict Has Fueled a Surge in Campus Censorship.](#)
51. [These are deeply disturbing patterns of censorship across Australian universities.](#)
52. [How US universities are trying to muzzle pro-Palestine protests before they begin.](#)
53. [US professors face discipline and investigations over Palestine support.](#)
54. [Palestine exception.](#)
55. [The Palestine Exception to Free Speech: Censorship, Harassment Intensifies on Campus Amid Gaza War.](#)
56. [Once champions of free speech, colleges crack down on pro-Palestinian protests.](#)
57. [Academic Self-Censorship Under Trump: The Latest Middle East Scholar Barometer Findings.](#)
58. [At US universities, free speech isn't free for pro-Palestine activists.](#)
59. [Censorship is a crucial complement of genocide.](#)
60. [A Feminist Praxis for Academic Freedom in the Context of Genocide in Gaza.](#)
61. [Harvard journal accused of censoring article alleging genocide in Gaza.](#)
62. [Huge majority of M.E scholars say Gaza onslaught is 'akin to genocide,' but they self-censor their views.](#)
63. [The Threatening of Academic Freedom and Inclusion during the Gaza Genocide.](#)
64. [The crackdown on academic freedom in Europe: More than just a right-wing phenomenon.](#)
65. [Academic censorship on Palestine even extends to discussing Palestinian dance.](#)
66. [Academics and artists censored for encouraging sympathy for Palestinians.](#)
67. [I Was a Target of Academic Censorship Over My Work on Palestine.](#)
68. [Royal Academy in London censors anti-Gaza genocide art work by young people.](#)
69. [MEMO events: Academic Censorship in the UK.](#)
70. [Peer Review Boycott: Say No to Political Censorship.](#)
71. [Censorship and the University Press: What is the University Press's role in the modern world?.](#)
72. [Study finds scientific censorship more often self-inflicted and on the rise.](#)
73. ['Serious concerns': UK education row as Israel-Palestine textbooks pulled.](#)
74. [Peer-Review is Censorship not Quality Control.](#)
75. [Threat of repressive intolerance rises in academia.](#)
76. [Academic publishing and the \(hidden\) dynamics of censorship.](#)
77. [Is peer-review censorship or necessary evil?.](#)
78. [Covert censorship by the physics preprint archive: A personal perspective from Brian](#)

Josephson.

79. [The real reason for arXiv's censorship.](#)
80. [New paper explores censorship and self-censorship in science.](#)
81. [Does the arXiv censor submissions?.](#)
82. [Scientists Protest Censorship in Cosmology.](#)
83. [The perils of academic publishing.](#)
84. [Anti-Big Bang theory scientists face censorship by international journals.](#)
85. [Astrophysicists, Critical of Big Bang Theory, are Furious at Censorship.](#)
86. [Federal Oversight Targets Scholarly Publishing: Antitrust, Censorship, and the Expanding Case for Research Fraud Liability.](#)
87. [How Academia Failed the Test of the War in Gaza.](#)
88. [Academic censorship on sexual misconduct and power abuse: Not in our academia.](#)
89. [Message from the editor, The China Quarterly.](#)
90. [More on academic publishers censoring for China: an exchange with Palgrave about its parent SpringerNature.](#)
91. [Declaration To #DefendResearch Against US Government Censorship.](#)
92. [Harvard Censorship Is a Dangerous Precedent.](#)
93. [Protecting research from censorship: resources for scholarly publishers.](#)
94. [Academic Publishing in a Global Age of Extremes.](#)
95. [Large academic publishers are a single point of failure for academic freedom.](#)
96. [How the Chinese Censors Highlight Fundamental Flaws in Academic Publishing.](#)
97. [The Shocking Cancellation of a Special Issue.](#)
98. [Academic publishers bow to Chinese demands for censorship.](#)
99. [British publisher pulls academic journals from China after government complaint.](#)
100. [China censorship drive splits leading academic publishers.](#)
101. [The Freedom to Publish: Authors and Publishers Fighting SLAPPs and Censorship at London Book Fair.](#)
102. [Censorship of Online Research Journals in China: Conditions of Complicity and Resistance in the Global Scholarly Communications Industry.](#)
103. [Cambridge University Press blocks readers in China from articles.](#)
104. [In China, Sometimes 90% Is Better Than Nothing.](#)
105. [Academic censorship on Palestine even extends to discussing Palestinian dance.](#)
106. [Censorship is a crucial complement of genocide.](#)
107. [Harvard Journal Abruptly Cancels Issue on Palestine, Sparking Accusations of Censorship.](#)

108. ‘Censorship and Discrimination’: 200+ Scholars Slam Canceling of Harvard Journal Issue on Palestine.
109. Harvard journal allegedly censors article holding Israel responsible for genocide.
110. Gaza and Academic Self-Censorship.
111. In Open Letter, More Than 360 Academics Blast Cancellation of Harvard Educational Review Issue on Palestine.
112. Israel and Censorship at Harvard.
113. My First Censorship Experience.
114. Scholars Who Study the Middle East Are Afraid to Speak Out: Polling data indicate widespread self-censorship.
115. [aaa](#).
116. Organizations Speak Out Against Trump’s Censorship of Data, Journal Publications.
117. Declaration To #DefendResearch Against US Government Censorship.
118. Researchers Funded by Department of Education Ordered Not to Publish Research Results Without Prior Written Approval.
119. Declaration To Defend Research against Censorship in the United States.
120. Some scientific and medical journal editors vow to resist new government censorship. Will they stand strong?.
121. Silence in the classroom: A stark look at academic self-censorship.
122. Self-censorship, controversy and taboo in psychological science.
123. Watching Their Words: Faculty Say They’re Self-Censoring.
124. Science Has a Censorship Problem.